This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

http://books.google.com

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A volume in the Hyperion reprint series

THE RADICAL TRADITION IN AMERICA

HYPERION PRESS, INC.

Westport, Connecticut

Digitized by Google

"THE WAY OF HOLINESS."

A SERIES OF PAPERS

FORMERLY PUBLISHED IN THE PERFECTIONIST, AT NEW HAVEN.

ER
85
.N69
1976

BY JOHN H. NOYES.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
BLOOMINGTON

"An highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called, The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."
Isaiah. XXXV. 8.

PRINTED BY J. H. NOYES & Co.
Putney, Vermont.
1838.

Digitized by Google

Published in 1838 by J.H. Noyes & Co., Putney, Vermont
Hyperion reprint edition 1976
Library of Congress Catalog Number 75-337
ISBN 0-88355-240-X
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Noyes, John Humphrey, 1811-1886.
"The way of holiness."

(The Radical tradition in America)
Reprint of the 1838 ed. published by J.H. Noyes, Putney, Vt.
1. Theology – Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Title.
BR85.N69 1976 335'.9'74764 75-337
ISBN 0-88355-240-X

This copy has been reproduced from microfilm supplied by New York Public Library. All possible care has been taken in the reproduction, and print quality is a reflection of the condition of the original text.

7-24-76

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

This book contains the result of a laborious investigation of Scripture, pursued during two years and a half, at Andover and New Haven, under the instructions of Professor Stuart and Dr. Taylor.

The author was taught by Prof. Stuart, that the seventh chapter of Romans is *not* a description of Christian experience. Thus the most formidable objection to the doctrine of perfect holiness was removed, and a license given to question the infallibility of popular and traditionary interpretation, which greatly facilitated the removal of all others.

He was also taught by the same distinguished interpreter, that the twenty fourth chapter of Matthew refers, not as is commonly supposed to a future judgment, but to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem. Novel and startling as the suggestion was, the evidence of its truth constrained assent, and the train of deductions which will be found in this book, naturally and rapidly followed.

He was taught by Dr. Taylor to doubt the dogma of Calvinism, that "sin is the necessary means of the greatest good;" to believe in the reasonableness of God's requisitions as a law,

Digitized by Google

giver, and the sincerity of his proposals as a Savior. Man's ability and infinite obligation now and forever to obey a perfect law, were so incessantly exhibited, and convincingly demonstrated, that no resting-place was left in any standard short of perfect holiness.

These remarks are made—not for the purpose of fastening upon Prof. Stuart and Dr. Taylor the odium of the heresies of this book—for its author has learned by hard experience, that the common practice of making a public teacher responsible for all the deductions of those who hear him, is as dishonest as it is cruel—but for the purpose of giving an honest history of the process, by which so far as human agency is concerned, modern Perfectionism originated.

The natural tendency and actual result of the exegesis of Prof. Stuart, and the metaphysics of Dr. Taylor, was on the one hand to beget a general distrust of the theological systems which were convicted by them of gross and fundamental errors, and on the other, to give that fulness of force to the simple truths of Scripture, that crushing weight to the claims of the law of God which perfects conviction, and prepares the spirit for the perfect righteousness of God.

Mainly under these influences as the instruments of the grace of God, in Feb. 1834 the author of this book became a Perfectionist.

The substance of the testimony of this book,

Digitized by Google

was printed and circulated at that time, in three small handbills, entitled—"He that committeth sin is of the devil." "The New Covenant," and "The Second Coming of the Son of Man"—and in a pamphlet, entitled—"Paul not carnal." The handbills were afterwards expanded into the articles which will be found in this book under the same titles. The pamphlet is republished in its original form. In August following, a paper was commenced, entitled, The Perfectionist, under the superintendence of James Boyle, who, during the spring and summer intervening, had become a believer of the leading doctrines of Perfectionism. The writer of this book was six months connected with that publication, as a contributor and subordinate editor, during which time most of the following articles were published.

Many reasons might be stated for the present republication of them; but it is sufficient to mention the following:—1. They have been thought worthy of a more attentive examination, and a more continued circulation, than newspaper publications generally secure. 2. As they are in fact an abridgement of what is valuable in the Perfectionist, they furnish inquirers, in a convenient and durable form, the means of ascertaining what most Perfectionists believe, without searching through the discordant and irrelevant discussions of the paper, or trusting the vague accounts of ignorant and hostile reporters.—

Digitized by Google

8. The author of them differs in sentiment, *essentially*, from many who are called Perfectionists, and especially from many whose writings were published in the paper, and therefore desires by withdrawing his own writings from the mass with which they have been connected, to limit his own responsibility, and leave every man to the reward of his own works.

Putney, Oct. 20th, 1838.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION TO THE PERFECTIONIST.	7
HE THAT COMMITTETH SIN IS OF THE DEVIL. . .	22
PAUL NOT CARNAL.	37
THE HOLINESS OF PAUL.	65
DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PROFESSOR AND A SINNER. .	87
OBJECTIONS.	91
THE SECOND COMING OF THE SON OF MAN. . . .	96
OBJECTIONS TO THE SECOND COMING.	119
THE NEW COVENANT.	126
THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS.	152
THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH. . . .	157
ANTICHRIST.	164
THE SABBATH.	177
BAPTISM.	189
FAITH.	202
THE RESURRECTION.	220

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION

TO THE PERFECTIONIST.

That we might give no occasion for the imputation of arrogance, in selecting a title for this sheet, expressive of its design, we have chosen the name which was originally bestowed upon ourselves and our sentiments, by the enemies of holiness, and which has been long and extensively an odious appellation. Perceiving nothing in the sound or form of the word, Perfectionist, essentially odious, and assuredly anticipating the time of its redemption from infamy, we content ourselves, for the present, with an explanation of its meaning, as used by those who bear it, in the place of any further apology for its selection.

We will not attempt to state what a Perfectionist *is not*, for this would require us to dissect and disclaim all the varying and incongruous images of Perfection, conjured up by the word in the various fancies of men, from a picture of a monk in sackcloth and ashes, to that of a seraph with six wings. It is sufficient to say, that in the minds of those who consent to bear the name, so far as we know, Perfection is predicated of only a single attribute, viz. holiness, and of that only in a limited sense. We find in the bible as well as in the nature of the case, three modifications of *perfect holiness:* perfec-

Digitized by Google

tion of obedience; perfection of security of obedience; and perfection of holiness by experience or suffering. These distinctions may be easily understood by a simple illustration. The success of a general on a battle-field, may be perfect in a threefold manner. 1. He may be simply successful at the outset. 2. He may be sucessful at the outset, with an assurance of final victory. 3. He may be successful by the actual accomplishment of the victory.

1. The holiness of Adam, and of the angels that left their first estate, was perfect, considered simply as obedience to law, but destitute of prospective security, as was proved by their apostacy.

2. The holiness of Christ, the second Adam, was perfect, both as present obedience to law, and as prospectively secure. Yet in another sense it was imperfect, during his residence on earth. For "though he were a *Son*, yet *learned he obedience* by the things which he suffered; and *being made perfect*, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him—for it became him, by whom are all things, and for whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory to make the captain of their salvation *perfect through sufferings*." Previous to his crucifixion, this captain of our salvation was perfectly successful in his conflict with sin both presently and prospectively; yet the battle was before him. So Paul, while counting all things but loss, that he might over-

Digitized by Google

come death by knowing the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ, denied that he had already attained the victory, or was already perfect; and yet in the next breath, falling back upon an inferior meaning of the word, he could say, "let us therefore, as many as be perfect be thus minded."

3. The present holiness of Christ, on the throne of his glory, and of those who, having overcome by his blood, have attained that likeness of his resurrection, toward which Paul was urging his way, is perfected in the highest sense. The battle is fought—the victory is won—their holiness is perfect as obedience, perfect in security, and perfect by victory over suffering.

Perfectionists, then, if they may be allowed to designate the place which they suppose they hold on the scale of perfection, universally disclaim the profession of attainments above those of the *suffering* Son of God. They covet not the premature glory of victory before battle. They stand with Paul on the middle ground, between the perfection of Adam and of Christ, saved from sin —eternally saved, yet "saved by hope, waiting for the adoption; to wit, the redemption of their bodies."

We acknowledge the phrase, *perfect holiness*, is almost a solecism in the first of the three senses above mentioned, for any thing short of perfect *present* obedience, is perfect disobedience; and we might as well speak of the imperfect success of a

Digitized by Google

the man who sees nothing but mysticism in such a confession, knows not Christ; hence, more particularly,

5. We believe that by far the greatest portion of the religion in the world named Christianity, is the work of Antichrist, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

6. We believe all the essential features of Judaism and of its successor, Popery may be distinctly traced in nearly every form of Protestantism, and though we rejoice in the blessings which the reformation has given us, we regard it as rightly named, the Reformation, it being an improvement of Antichrist, not a restoration of Christianity.

Such is the matter of our faith. We need say nothing of the manner and means by which we shall propagate it. "The battle is the Lord's," and he bids us go forth in confidence, "praising the BEAUTY OF HOLINESS." The truth which is becoming the pole-star of our souls is—"God is love," and we believe he will destroy the man of sin, the son of perdition, by the *brightness* of his coming, for the love of God is a consuming fire.

Digitized by Google

form is as much above the ground of mere holiness as a deed in fee simple is above mere possession.

As obedience is the test of all holiness, so we believe, under the gospel, *perpetuity of obedience* is the test of all holiness. Here we may speak, without solecism, of perfect holiness; and here we are exposed to a more plausible charge of arrogance. Let us examine the ground of this charge. Without entering the wide field of scripture argument, it is sufficient for our purpose to notice a single fact in relation to the views of those who most freely stigmatize the supposed self-righteousness of Perfectionists. These very persons universally and confessedly expect, at death, to become Perfectionists, and that, not merely of the second, but of the third degree: in other words, while earthly Perfectionists claim only secure deliverance from sin, their accusers anticipate, within a brief space, secure deliverance from sin and all evil. What is the consideration which exempts their anticipation from the charge of self-righteous presumption, and yet leaves the burden upon our claim? Their answer assuredly must be, "we anticipate, at death, secure redemption from sin and evil, as the *gift of the grace of God.*" But the self same apology relieves our claim. We *receive* present redemption from sin as the gift of the grace of God—we only enter, "by a new and living way" upon

the possession of a portion of that gratuitous inheritance, which they expect to receive at death. We must be permitted, then, to say boldly, that the same rule which allows men to *hope* for heaven without presumption, allows us to *receive* heaven here without self-righteousness: and the charge of arrogance is due to those who hope for the gift, while they daily displease the giver.

The same Christ who will be the believer's portion in heaven, is our righteousness and sanctification here. While, therefore, we shrink not from the odium, connected with the name, *Perfectionist*, we cannot despair of disabusing all honest men, ere long, of a portion of their prejudices against it, by convincing them that we join in the testimony of our living head, that "there is none good but one, that is God," and believe that by the energy of his goodness alone are we delivered from sin.

The standard by which every man judges of the nature of true humility—and of its opposite—spiritual pride, is determined by the answer which his heart gives to the question—"who is the author of righteousness?" If the credit of holiness is due to him who professes it, then his profession exalts himself at the expense of God, and justly exposes him to the charge of spiritual arrogance—however high or low may be his claim. But if God alone is acknowledged as the author of righteousness, a profession of holiness is only the

Digitized by Google

acknowledgement of a gift—and not only consistent with, but necessary to, the exercise of true humility. The man who has no conception of any righteousness other than his own, may well count the confession of imperfection—genuine modesty.

From such we expect no mercy. But if there are any who ascribe all righteousness to God, we hope to convince them that the arrogance which boasts of the "Lord our righteousness" is the perfection of humility—and that the profession of humility which delights in the confession of sin and in the expectation of a continued commission of it, is only a modest way of robbing Christ of the crown of his glory.

Is it imagined that the man to whom God in truth has given perfect holiness, has done some great thing? He has done nothing. The great achievement of his will which, be it remembered, the grace of God has secured, is the cessation from his own works, and the commencement of an everlasting repose on the energy of the living God, as the basis and hope of his righteousness. He has simply died—and with his dying breath bequeathed his body, soul and spirit to his Maker, rolling the responsibility of his future and eternal obedience upon the everlasting arm.

We believe it is incomparably easier to receive deliverance from all sins, than to conquer one.

Paul clearly presents the principle in Romans i. 21—32, which accounts for the difficulty man

Digitized by Google

find in obtaining freedom from sin. Because they refuse to glorify God, he *gives them up* to vile affections. The affections of men are rightfully under the perfect control of God. When he is dethroned, he abandons his kingdom—and anarchy ensues—every effort to quell the rebellion of desires, which falls short of a reinstatement of God in his sovereignty over the heart, must result in disheartning failure. But why should it be difficult for him who stands at the door, if his petition for entrance is heard, and his claim for dominion admitted, to restore peace and security to the ruined kingdom? Why should it be thought an incredible thing that God should raise the dead?

Pride, envy, anger, sensuality, &c. are but limbs of the tree of sin, the stock of which is that unbelief which rejects the righteousness of God.

The man who commences the work of exterminating sin at the top of the tree, or among any of the branches, will soon be disheartened by the discovery that the branches he has once lopped off, soon grow again, or send their juice into other limbs. We say therefore it is easier to lay the axe at the root and fell the whole tree at once, than to exterminate effectually a single limb.

In view of these considerations, though we object not to the name—Perfectionists—and though we verily believe and unblushingly maintain that we are free from sin, we beg to be relieved of the glory, and of the shame of the achievement; we

Digitized by Google

have been taught with the scourge, that the day has come when "all the haughtiness of men shall be brought low, and the Lord alone exalted."

At the hazard of a fresh and heavier imputation of arrogance, than our name has yet incurred, we now proceed to state in few words, some things which we believe, and some of the principles which will guide our present and future efforts.

1. We believe the gospel is emphatically glad tidings of redemption from sin; and Christianity is distinguished from the dispensation which preceded it, chiefly by the fact, that it brings in everlasting righteousness—hence,

2. We believe that sinners are not Christian—we object not to calling some of them Jewish saints, or sinful believers, or unconverted disciples, or servants of God, as distinguished from sons—but we affirm that they are out of Christ; for "he that abideth in him, sinneth not—he that sinneth, hath not seen him neither known him."

3. We believe that "Christ is come in the flesh," that he dwells in and controls believers, and thus secures their perfect holiness; that the body of Christ which is the church, is nourished and guided by the life and wisdom of its Head.

4. We believe that "every spirit which confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God," but is Antichrist, whatever may be its professions of faith and holiness; and that

Digitized by Google

general who never began to conquer, as to speak of the imperfect holiness of one who has not yet obeyed God. The truth is too simple to need expansion, that every individual action is either wholly sinful or wholly righteous; and that every being in the universe, at any given time, is either entirely wicked or entirely holy, i. e. either conformed to law or not conformed to law; yet the prevailing modes of thought and speech, force us to recognize a quality of action and character, called *imperfect holiness*, which takes rank somewhere indefinitely below what may seem the lowest possible, or conceivable modification of holiness. So that, with reference to this, we must name *mere* holiness, *perfect* holiness, consigning the censure due to the impropriety of our language, to those who maintain the possibility of serving God and mammon, i. e. of being holy and sinful at the same time. A profession, then, of *perfect* holiness, thus understood, is in truth, merely a profession of holiness, without which, confessedly, none can claim the name of sons or servants of God, and instead of deserving the charge of arrogance, should rather be censured, if at all, for conveying, in the language of it, the implication that men may be less than perfectly holy, and yet not perfectly sinful. But we take higher ground. The first Adam was holy; the second Adam was, in a more proper sense, perfectly holy—his holiness was secure. The gospel plat-

Digitized by Google

WHAT WE BELIEVE.

WE BELIEVE, 1. that God, is the only rightful interpreter of the Bible, and teacher of theological truth,—hence,

2. That no doctrine can become an article of *true faith*, which is not recognised by the believer as an immediate revelation to him from God:

3. That God, "*who worketh all in all*," can and does teach his own truth, through his written word, and through the testimony of his sons,

4 That it is proper, that we should state, as *witnesses* for God, the fundamental articles of our own faith.

5. That "there is none good but one, that is God,"—that all the righteousness in the universe is God's righteousness.

6. That God's righteousness may be revealed in his creatures, as a man's spirit is revealed in the motions of his body.

7. That "the works of the flesh, [i. e. human nature,] are adultery, uncleanness, envyings, strife, and *such like*" *only*.

8. That all attempts to produce better results from human nature, by instruction and legal discipline, only increase the evil, inasmuch as they refine and disguise, without removing it.

9. That the Son of God was manifested in hu-

Digitized by Google

man nature for the purpose of destroying, (not reforming,) the works of the flesh, and revealing the righteousness of God.

10. That the righteousness of God was never revealed in human nature, till the birth of Jesus Christ.

11. That the object of all God's dealings with the human race before the birth of Christ, was, *not* to promote the righteousness of the flesh, i. e. self-righteousness, i. e. the perfection of sin; but to prepare the way for the manifestation of his own righteousness through Jesus Christ,—hence,

12. That the righteousness of the saints, under the law before Christ, was only a "*shadow* of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," bearing a relation to the true righteousness of God, like that of a type to its antitype.

13. That the servants of God under the law, by submission to the discipline of the dispensation in which they lived, were prepared for, and became heirs of the righteousness of God, afterward revealed by Jesus Christ.

14. That "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself," that the union of human and divine nature in him, made the righteousness of God accessible to all men.

15. That Christ is properly called the second Adam, and as the human race in spirit is one body, that he became, by his incarnation, "the light

Digitized by Google

that lighteth every man."

16. That all who are apprized by the gospel of the fact, that the Son of God has come, are thereby called to choose whether they will hold the fallen or the risen Adam as their head.

17. That faith alone receives, and unbelief alone rejects the blessings given to man by the second Adam,—by faith men *awake* to a perception of the truth as it is in Christ,—unbelief is the devil's dream.

18. That Christ, as he is in his *resurrection and glory*, is given to every member of the human race.

19. That all the faith, righteousness, liberty and glory of the risen Son of God, are given to every man.

20. That Christ in his incarnation was "made under the law," and that the christian dispensation did not commence, in any sense, till he ascended up on high.

21. That none are christians, in any sense, till they receive Christ in his resurrection: hence

22. That the disciples of Christ, during his personal ministry in the flesh, were not christians.

23. That Christ in the resurrection is free from sin, from the law, from all ordinances, and from death; hence, all who are subject to any of these, are not properly called christians, as not having attained the hope of their calling.

Digitized by Google

24. That the history which the Bible contains of the church after Christ's ascension, commonly called the primitive church, is a history rather of the *latter-day glory* of *Judaism*, than of the commencement of christianity.

25. That the apostles and primitive believers, so far as they were subject to sin, law and death, were Jews and not christians.

26. That Christ plainly and repeatedly promised to his disciples, that he would come to them a second time and complete their salvation within the *life-time* of some of his immediate followers.

27. That the primitive church, living in the transition period, from the first to the second coming of Christ, were more or less partakers of the resurrection, holiness, liberty, and glory of Christ according to their faith.

28. That at the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the Jewish dispensation, Christ came to believers the second time according to his promise.

29. That, at the period of the second coming of Christ, christianity, or the kingdom of heaven properly begun.

30. That this was the period of the full developement of the NEW COVENANT, (Heb. viii.) which secures to believers perfect and eternal salvation from sin, full freedom from written law, and human instruction.

31. That the whole body of Christ, i. e. the

Digitized by Google

church, attained the perfect resurrection of the spiritual body at his second coming.

32. That Antichrist, at the same period, attained the perfect resurrection of damnation.

33. That this was the period of the commencement of the judgment, (CRISIS, see the Greek,) of this world.

34. That after this period, the salvation given to all men in Jesus Christ, included nothing less than a perfect and eternal salvation from sin, a perfect redemption from the law and legal instruction, a perfect resurrection of the spiritual body, and a standing on the plain of eternity beyond the judgment.

Digitized by Google

"HE THAT COMMITTETH SIN IS OF THE DEVIL."

Much has been said and written, to show that John, in this declaration did not mean what he said. It is admitted on all hands that he did not mean *more* than he said; for assuming that his intention was to convey the idea, that any one who sins has no part or lot in the salvation of the gospel, he could not have expressed it more clearly in an equal number of words, than he has done in these. The only question is, whether he meant *less* than he said; whether his words are to be qualified in such a manner as to mitigate the rigor of their simple sense.

In determining this question, we shall resort, 1, to the context; 2, to other parts of Scripture; 3, to the nature of the case.

1. *The context.* "Every man that hath this hope [viz. of seeing Christ] in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, for sin is the transgression of the law; and ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not; whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him neither known him. Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous. He that com-

Digitized by Google

mitteth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God."

1. It is manifest in this passage, that the apostle was labouring seriously and earnestly to establish the truth, (whatever that truth may be,) that "he that committeth sin is of the devil." He has expressed it not less than eight times, in varying phraseology, within the compass of this short paragraph. Among all these expressions, we may surely expect to ascertain beyond controversy, whether he meant to assert that "he that committeth sin is of the devil," absolutely, or in a qualified sense. If he has not definitely and perfectly conveyed his meaning, he was either singularly unfortunate as a writer, or a wilful deceiver. But he cannot be misunderstood. Not a particle of evidence can be found in the whole paragraph, that he designed to suggest or admit any qualification of the simple declaration "he that committeth sin is of the devil." On the contrary, he has expressed the same idea in at least seven other instances without qualification; and in two instances, with

Digitized by Google

such a comparison as perfectly determines the extent of his meaning. "Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, *even as he* (*Christ*) *is pure.*" "He that doeth righteousness is righteous, *even as he is righteous.*" If it is not absolutely true that "he that committeth sin is of the devil," the apostle has eight times in succession repeated a false assertion without the least intimation of his covert meaning, and with such definitive explanations that we cannot avoid the conclusion, that he designed and earnestly laboured to establish those to whom he wrote in the belief of its truth.

2. The immediate context strongly intimates the nature and extent of the truth declared in the words in question. "Little children, *let no man deceive you;* he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous; he that committeth sin is of the devil." The apostle was evidently dwelling on a point, concerning which, the greatest danger of deception existed. We may well perceive the necessity of his caution, "let no man deceive you"—if we understand that he was insisting upon the truth that all men are either as righteous as Christ, or as wicked as the devil. Doubtless there were then, as there are now, multitudes who could not receive Christ's assertion, that "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit"—who believed it possi-

Digitized by Google

ble to serve God and Mammon at the same time. Such persons might be expected to deceive themselves and others. Hence it was needful that the truth on the subject should be stated with what seems to be almost puerile repetition, and with explicit caution against deception. There is no subject at this day, in respect to which, there is so much manifest looseness of thought, and tendency to self-deception, as the question, whether, and how much, men may sin and yet be christians. Human depravity teaches us to expect a tendency to lean away from the severe doctrine of the apostle. In these circumstances, his warning, "let no man deceive you," is not only appropriate to his subject, but a pledge of his plainness. With such a warning in his mouth, how could he use the language of poetry or metaphor? If he was honest, he could say no more nor less than he meant. If he did not mean, that all men are either as righteous as Christ or as wicked as the devil,he has done what he could, so far as language is concerned, to deceive those to whom he wrote, while he solemnly cautioned them against the delusions of others.

"Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous." As if he had said—"There are those who will try to deceive you with the notion, that there is such a thing as imperfect righteousness—sinful holiness, but beware of such. "He

Digitized by Google

that committeth sin is of the devil." If the common view of this passage is true, instead of diminishing the danger of deception, by his plainness and caution, he has greatly augmented it.

If he did not mean to convey the idea that men cannot sin at all and be christians, we confess, for ourselves, he has greatly deceived us.

Though by no means naturally inclined to exalt the standard of holiness, we have been compelled to believe, that John was a perfectionist of the highest standard, so far as the subject of holiness is concerned.

3. It is manifest, in the paragraph we have quoted, that the apostle's object was to establish a definite and intelligible test by which the children of God, and the children of the devil, might be distinguished. "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; he that doeth not righteousness is not of God." And forasmuch as he had already declared that "he that *doeth* righteousness, is righteous *even as Christ is righteous*," he virtually proposed this test; viz. "He that is not as righteous as Christ, is not of God;" in other words, he that committeth sin [without qualification] is a child of the devil." In this view of his language, the test is simple, intelligible, perfect. Two classes only are recognized, and they are easily and certainly distinguished. The children of God are perfectly holy. Sin in every case, proves the

Digitized by Google

subjects of it, children of the devil. If we substitute any of the common versions of this passage for the simple words as they stand in the text, we destroy the nature and value of the test. For example, "He that commiteth sin *habitually* is of the devil." Now it would puzzle the keenest casuist that ever "cavilled for the ninth part of a hair," to ascertain the limits, and define the meaning of the term, "habitual sin." Thus the virtue of the test is lost. This may be seen by an illustration. While the principle was held that "he who drinks ardent spirits habitually is intemperate," and no other test was known, nobody could with any satisfactory degree of accuracy, distinguish between the temperate and intemperate. Every man had his own standard of temperance. Some claimed the character of temperate men, because they drank only once a day; and some who drank before and after every meal thought themselves by no means habitual drinkers. But when the principle was established that, "he that drinks ardent spirits is intemperate," a perfect and practical test was furnished. A fulcrum was fixed for the action of that lever which has revolutionized the public sentiment of the civilized world. So, while the word "habitually" is added to the declarations of the word of God concerning sin, we can expect nothing but looseness of thought and looseness of practice, which shall confound all valuable distinctions between saints

Digitized by Google

and sinners. Receive the word of God as it stands, "he that committeth sin is of the devil" and a fulcrum is fixed for a lever which by the power of God, shall ere long turn an inverted world upside down. These remarks apply with equal force to various other versions of John's "hard saying." e. g. "He that committeth *known* sin is of the devil." "He that committeth *wilful* sin is of the devil." "He that committeth sin is of the devil *while committing sin.*" &c. But it is needless to protract this examination. It is perfectly manifest to every candid reader, that John intended to take the high ground of TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM SIN; and we are so uncharitable (if it must be called uncharitable) as to believe that they who insist upon inserting the words "habitual," "known," "wilful," &c. in his unqualified declarations—in so doing, commit *habitual, known, and wilful sin.*

II. *Other parts of Scripture.* If we can clearly ascertain the sense of one assertion of God's word, we need no more proof to establish the truth which it exhibits. If that word by legitimate rules of interpretation applied to every part individually, is not consistent with itself, its authority is destroyed. Yet we have thought it well, for the sake of those who make a great account of what is called the "analogy of faith," the principle by which one part of Scripture is distorted into seeming consistency with another, and by

Digitized by Google

the abundant use of which systems of divinity, creeds, &c. discordant as they are, have usually been consructed, to show by a few examples, that John is not the only writer in the Bible who denies that they who sin have any part or lot with Christ.

Paul says—"If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." Rom. 8. 13. Who live after the flesh but they that commit sin?

Again: "If while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves are found sinners, is Christ therefore the minister of sin? God forbid." Gal. ii. 17. Having shown that believers are justified by Christ, and not by the works of the law, the Antinomian question suggests itself to the apostle, whether justification by Christ abolishes the necessity of personal holiness—whether Christ will justify, and thus serve men in their sins? He replies with a decisive negative, and proceeds to show that in true believers Christ makes an end of the law and its works, by living in them, crucifying their flesh, and making them personally partakers of his perfect righteousness.

James says—"Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of this world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. iv. 4. Most professing christians will admit that this is true in some general and indefinite sense. If it is true in any sense, a "worldly christian" (we

Digitized by Google

use the language of antichrist) is an enemy of God. But we may easily perceive that it is true in its most rigorous sense, by attending to the hint furnished by the address with which it begins: "*Ye adulterers and adulteresses.*" The apostle is dealing with professors of religion: for he says immediately before, "*Ye ask* and receive not," &c. showing that the persons he addressed recognized God as the source of blessing, and he afterwards characterises them as "*double-minded*," v.8. We understand then that he called them adulterers and adulteresses, because they professed to stand in the covenant of God, which the Bible every where represents as a *marriage covenant*, and yet loved the world. In other words, the love of the world is a breach of a marriage covenant with God—spiritual adultery. Now let any one consider how delicate and sacred the marriage relation is, as it exists between two fellow-worms, how the least suspicion of a single instance of unfaithfulness destroys all fellowship; and he will understand how often and how long men may commit adultery with the world, and yet remain in marriage covenant and fellowship with the great God.

As it is this class of persons, called by James the "double-minded," i. e. "worldly christians," whose standing is principally concerned in the interpretation of our "hard saying," "he that committeth sin is of the devil," we will notice

Digitized by Google

particularly several other passages which treat of their case.

Mat. vi. 22, 23. "The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light: but if thine eye he evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness?" In the first two clauses of this passage, Christ represents all men as either full of light or full of darkness: i. e. wholly righteous or wholly sinful; for all men have either a single or an evil eye. In the last clause he evidently alludes to the case of those, who, *having an evil eye*, imagine themselves at least *partially righteous*, and thus put darkness for light. That this is his meaning, appears from what immediately follows: "No man can serve two masters" &c. "If the light that is in thee be darkness," i. e. if you have an understanding of religious truth, profess and believe yourself to be in the way of righteousness, while yet your eye is not single, while you are seeking to serve both God and Mammon, "how great is that darkness!" The expression intimates what is manifestly true, that "a worldly christian," a "double minded" man, is in greater moral darkness, than a mere heedless sinner.

Compare Mat. xxiv. 48—51, with Luke xii. 45, 46. In these passages we have a clear description of the character and doom of a double.

Digitized by Google

minded man. 1. He is an "*evil servant*," not an open rebel, neither a good servant, but a rebel at heart, and a servant by profession: in other words, an adulterer, a double-minded man, who is seeking to serve God and mammon. 2. He takes advantage of the delay of his master to indulge himself in wickedness, saying, "My lord delayeth his coming;" an exact pattern of the case of those who neglect preparation for meeting Christ, in expectation of death-bed sanctification. 3. His master comes upon him unexpectedly, cuts him off, and assigns him a portion with *hypocrites and unbelievers*. This last expression intimates that he was neither entirely a hypocrite, nor an unbeliever. In some sense he was truly a servant of his master; in some sense he was a believer, but he was an *evil* servant, a *wicked* believer, and therefore unexpectedly shared the doom of sheer hypocrites and unbelievers.

In John viii. 30–44, we have a delineation of the character and standing of wicked believers. Observe. 1. The persons there spoken of *believed* on Christ. 2. They thought themselves Abraham's seed and therefore heirs of the promises. 3. They denied that they were in bondage. 4. They thought themselves the children of God. Christ declared to them the test—"whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." They disputed, cavilled, rejected his word, as thousands of wicked believers do in this day;

Digitized by Google

He said to them plainly at last, "Ye are of your father the devil." For this they called him a Samaritan, and a child of the devil: such is now the usual result of the application of John's test, "He that committeth sin is of the devil."

Rev. iii. 14—18, describes a double minded church. It appears that this church was well pleased with its supposed good estate. But Christ gives us to understand that he loathed its character more than he would have done had there been no profession of righteousness.

We give but a specimen of that testimony concerning sin, which is the most prominent characteristic of the New Testament and indeed of the whole Bible. We give enough to show that the scripture makes but two classes among men, the children of God, and the children of the devil, and subdividing the children of the devil into careless sinners and religious sinners, or unbelievers and "double minded" assigns the lowest place to the latter class.

III. *The nature of the case.* Every body admits in some general sense that sin characterizes the children of the devil, and holiness the children of God. The only question that calls for discussion is whether sin is of such a nature that a *single instance* of the commission of it is a sufficient criterion of character. For the sake of illustration we put another question: Is the juice of a tree of such a nature that a single specimen of the fruit

Digitized by Google

it produces is a sufficient criterion of the character of the tree? We are authorised by right reason as well as by the example of Christ, to use this illustration. As in the case of the tree, *one* principle of vitality pervades every limb, so that there is a unity of character, and the nature of all its fruit may be known by one specimen; so in the case of moral beings, one principle of action, call it heart, or "governing purpose," or what you will, pervades the whole conduct of the man, and one clearly ascertained instance of moral action decides his whole character. Can a man's heart be opposed to *all* sin and yet his conduct be sinful? If so, he acts contrary to his own will, which is absurd. If his heart is only opposed to sin "in general," if he has only what is called a 'supreme', not an entire or perfect purpose to avoid sin, he may indeed, consistently with such a heart, sin more or less as occasion demands, but let him compare such a heart with the law of God; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all* thy heart," &c. and he will discover that his "governing purpose" is a sinful one, and therefore corrupts his whole character. Sin, and sin only is the legitimate fruit of such a "governing purpose." This is true of every "governing purpose" which falls short of the perfect love of God which the law requires, and when that perfect love of God is attained, sin is no more. If men love God with *all* the heart, they cannot sin, and if they do not love

Digitized by Google

him with all the heart, their governing purpose is sinful, and therefore they can *only* sin.

James spoke good philosophy when he said, "he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all." The principle involved in that saying has a wider sweep than is generally discovered. He that offendeth in one point is guilty of a breach of the whole law; his offence betrays a state of heart, which under similar circumstances would break every specific commandment, and which now violates the spirit of that whole law, which requires universal love. He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all the sins of the universe, past, present, and to come, for he endorses the whole, and by one act, so far as lies in his power makes himself responsible for the whole. If ten persons endorse successively a bill of exchange each one becomes responsible for the whole amount. So every person who commits sin, by so doing endorses the bill of universal sin. What though he has not exhibited so barefaced impiety as others? If he in a single instance commits sin, he places himself in fellowship with all sinners and makes the barefaced impiety of others his own. The accessory is equally guilty with the murderer, and every instance of sin makes him who commits it accessory to the Prince of murderers. If this principle is correct, every sinner without exception is as guilty as the devil. Every principle of common law and common sense developes the

Digitized by Google

truth of John's test, "he that committeth sin is of the Devil."

NOTE.

The reader will perceive as he proceeds in the perusal of this volume, that the doctrine of the preceding article, viz. *that perfect holiness is the only standard of true Christianity*, is the primary and paramount heresy of Perfectionism. The divers and strange doctrines that follow, will all be found secondary, and tributary to this. By demonstrating the perfect holiness of Paul, which is the object of two succeeding articles, we establish the truth of the doctrine *historically*, thus relieving it of the distrust, which naturally attaches to mere theory. By proving that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem, which is another important object in the discussions of this book, we set aside all objections to our doctrine which are drawn from the sins of saints who lived before that period. Our argument, then, for the feasibility of Perfection stands thus—if Paul, living in the mere dawn of the dispensation of the second coming, preached and practised perfect holiness, *much more* may we, living in the nineteenth century of that dispensation, believe and confess that Christ has made an end of sins.—These remarks are made for the purpose of leading the mind of the reader to a perception of that unity of subject, which justifies us in entitling this book—THE WAY OF HOLINESS.

Digitized by Google

PAUL NOT CARNAL.

AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS vii. 7—25

What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.

Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good: that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not: but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me: but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members warring a-

Digitized by Google

gainst the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.—*Romans vii.* 7—25.

This passage (especially from the 14th to the 23d verse,) is commonly received throughout Christendom, as a description of *Christian* experience, nay, as the experience of the greatest of the apostles, the *best* specimen of Christianity. Believing this view of the passage to be palpably erroneous, and exceedingly pernicious, we propose, in the following dissertation, to present some of the prominent reasons for adopting a different interpretation.

That our design may be clearly understood, before subjoining the reasons proposed, we present a paraphrase of the passage, as follows, (beginning at the 7th verse.)

"We said above (in the 5th verse) that the motions of sins which were *by the law*, did work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death. What shall we say then? It appears the *law* is the *occasion* of the motions of sins, and the fruit is death. Is the law in fault? Is aggravated guilt and death the object, and legitimate result, of the application of law? God forbid; on the contrary, its object, and *actual* result is not the promotion, but the *exposure*, of sin. I should

Digitized by Google

never have come to the knowledge of sin, but by the light of the law ; where there is no law there is no sin : where the light of the law (i.e. the expression of the will of God) is feeble, as in the case of the heathen, their consciousness of sin is correspondingly feeble: and where, as in my own case, the light of the law, by direct revelation, becomes strong, the consciousness of sin, if the sinful principle remains, becomes correspondingly strong. I should never have recognized the existence and guilt of forbidden desire, in my heart, if the law had not expressly said, thou shalt not covet, (i.e. indulge inordinate desire,) thereby carrying its claims beyond external action, into the thoughts and intents of the heart.

So that the law, instead of being the efficient cause of sin, is the means of its exposure and condemnation. (8.) The fatal result, therefore, of the application of law in my case, is to be ascribed, not to the law, but to my own wickedness.

The sinful principle, which was within me, before, instead of ceasing to exist in consequence of the additional light and motive of a revealed law, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of forbidden desire.

Its evil nature was aggravated and developed by the opposing claims of the law. For before I came to a knowledge of the law, the sinful principle was dead. It made no manifestation of its pernicious power and I was not aware, of its ex-

Digitized by Google

istence. (9.) At that time, sin thus being dead, I was alive, free from the curse of an evil conscience and expectation of wrath, happy, independently of the grace of God. But this was because I had no just views of the law. When the commandment came home to my soul, in its power and spirituality, the sinful principle, which had been comparatively powerless and dead, revived. I became conscious of its existence and malignity. As I have said, its evil nature was aggravated and developed by the opposing claims of the law. As light increased, by the necessity of the case, so long as the sinful principle remained, its malignity and fatal power increased. I became worse and worse, my case more and more hopeless, till I sunk into despair of salvation and died. (10.) In this way, the commandment, which was ordained unto life, I found to be the occasion (not the efficient or legitimate cause) of death. (11.) It was my own wicked heart, that made the increased light and motive of the law, an occasion of aggravated perversity. I was deceitfully led on by it, from one degree of wickedness to another, till I sunk down under hopeless condemnation.

(12.) Wherefore, notwithstanding the fatal result of its application, we must pronounce the law holy, and the commandment holy, just and good.

(13.) As there is a difficulty in discerning

Digitized by Google

how a thing can be good, and yet be the occasion of evil, that we may view the subject in all its bearings, we repeat the question in substance, which was asked at the outset. How can we pronounce the law holy, just and good, and yet affirm that the consequence of its application was death to my soul? Was that which is *good* made death unto me? God forbid. Death, as we have repeatedly said, is no part of the design, or legitimate result, of the law, but must be ascribed, in my case, *wholly* to my own wickedness. In this view of the subject, the malignity of the sinful principle is clearly developed. What greater proof can we have of its evil nature, than the fact that it works death by that which is *good*? A *good* from that which is *evil*. But here the reverse is true. Evil is extracted from that which is good. Thus sin by the commandment becomes *exceeding sinful*.

(14.) But to trace out more definitely, and in detail, the process, by which the law becomes an occasion of death, we say the fatal result flows from the *incongruity*, or opposition, which exists between my nature, or condition, as a man in the flesh, and the claims of the law. For the law is spiritual, its claims extend to the thoughts and intents of the heart, it proposes to control the *spirit*; of course its claims can be met only by one, whose spirit is *free, predominant over the flesh*; whereas I am carnal, sold under sin. My inferior propen-

Digitized by Google

sities predominate over my spiritual nature, and lend captive my will. In this state, it is *impossible* for me to obey the law. They that are in the flesh *cannot* please God. My spiritual nature must predominate, before I *can* obey a law, whose claims are spiritual. So that the law, shedding its light upon me, while in the flesh, only shows me the impossibility of obedience and salvation, so long as the flesh predominates over the spirit. Remaining then in the flesh, the bond slave of sin, the law, which I know is spiritual, and which my conscience approves as holy, just and good, only wakes the sinful principle within me to tenfold malignity and power.

(15) Thus I am brought into a deadly warfare with myself. The commandment, like a two edged sword, pierces even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit. I become, as it were, *two beings*.

Reason, conscience, and constitutional self-love take sideswith God and the law. My inferior propensities, having the will under their control, array themselves *against* their claims. A conflict commences between my spiritual and carnal nature, in which the flesh uniformly triumphs.

For that which I do under the control of the flesh, as a rational being enlightened by the law, I allow not. What conscience and self-love constrain me to wish to do, that do I not, but what I hate, because I know the guilt and ruin it brings upon me, that do I.

Digitized by Google

(16.) It is plain then, if I do that which, as a rational being, I would not, I consent unto the law, that it is good, perceiving its adaptation to secure the well being of my spiritual nature, notwithstanding the opposition of my carnal nature and will to his claims. (17.) Now then it is no more I that act thus, in opposition to conscience and the law, but sin that dwelleth in me. The time was, when reason, conscience and self-love consented to the course of my carnal nature and my will, and then it might be said, *I* did what was done.

But now my being is divided; I have, as it were, two wills, at war with each other, and the best half of my nature is arrayed on the side of that will, which opposes my actual doings. My fleshly propensities, though they control the will, are unworthy to be called *the man*. *I*, as a *spiritual* being, no longer consent to my own actions. Sin that dwelleth in me, subjecting the whole man to its control, drags me into conflict with the law. While the noblest of my powers, those which most truly constitute me a *man*, take sides with the law, my actions are uniformly in opposition to its claims. Truly this exhibits the *exceeding sinfulness* of sin.

(18) I now know, since the spiritual claims of the law have enlightened my understanding, and developed my sinful condition, that in me, that is, in my flesh, in the carnal nature which belongs

Digitized by Google

to me as an unregenerate man, there dwelleth *no good thing*. It has come to be a certainty with me, that I shall never perform right action while in the flesh. When I look upon the goodness of the law of God, and upon the happiness of its subjects, as a rational being, I long to obey it. To will is present with me. My hungerings after righteousness even exhibit themselves in efforts, and resolutions of obedience, which either contemplate mere specific action, without a radical change of principle, or respect future, and not present obedience, and, of course, prove abortive. How to perform that which is good, I find not.

(19.) For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do. After all my wishes and resolutions, I act uniformly, in direct opposition to the dictates of my better nature, (20.) And I say again, if I do that, that I would not, if my spiritual nature, that which only deserves to be called *the man*, approves the law which condemns my actions, it is no more *I* that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me, which, in thus dragging me, I may say, against my will, into conflict with the law, manifests its exceeding sinfulness.

(21.) I find then at last, by the ruinous conflict I have sketched, I am forced upon the conclusion, that sin is an abiding, universal principle within me. The law which controls my spirit, is the very reverse of that law which my conscience ap-

Digitized by Google

proves. The rule by which I live is this, "*when I would do good, evil is present with me.*" Being the servant of sin, I am *totally* free from righteousness. (vi. 20.)

(22.) I hesitate not to use the expression, "*when I would do good,*" for I delight in the law of God, after the inner man. I see its goodness and glory, and long to be a subject of it. I look into the kingdom which it sways, and involuntarily delight in the beauty of the prospect. I wish an omnipotent arm would take me up and place me beyond the gate, within its precincts. (23.) But how to enter that gate, I find not. A present and full surrender of the sinful principle, a triumph of my spiritual over my carnal nature, alone can give me admission to that kingdom. Here, on the very threshhold of obedience, and salvation, I find myself morally impotent. I see a *law* in my carnal nature, warring against the law of God and of my own spiritual nature, and triumphing in the conflict, bringing me into captivity to the law of sin and death. Thus sin, which was dead when I was alive without the law, by the coming of the commandment, has revived, and with merciless, living malignity, is driving me to despair. I am dying to hope and happiness, (24.) Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? (25.) (I thank God, who is able, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to deliver a soul thus sinking to perdition, as we shall see in the

Digitized by Google

chapter following.) We conclude then, from what has been said, that I myself, as a man without Christ, in the flesh, under law, with my spiritual nature, that which constitutes me a man, serve the law of God, and yet with my flesh, that part of my nature which predominates, and controls my will, I serve the law of sin; thus according to the principle stated at the beginning of this discussion, in the 5th verse, by the knowledge and approval of that law which condemns my actions, bringing upon myself aggravated guilt condemnation and death."

It will be seen, by a glance at the foregoing paraphrase, that we view the passage in question, as a description of the exercises, not of a Christian, nor yet of an ordinary unbeliever, but of a sinner *dying under the law*, of one, to whom the commandment has come, in whom sin is reviving, and who is thus sinking without a Saviour into hopeless condemnation.

We subjoin the following reasons for adopting this interpretation. I. The necessity of it appears on *the face of the language* of the passage. We concede that some of the expressions are descriptive of the exercises of Christians, e. g. "I delight in the law of God after the inward man," &c. Yet we affirm that they are equally descriptive of the exercises of convicted sinners, who recognize the goodness and glory of the law, which condemns their actions, and under which they

Digitized by Google

are dying. We affirm that intellectual delight in the law of God is the essential cause of conviction, and that the exceeding sinfulness of sin is never so fully developed, as when it drags its victim down to death, in defiance of the remonstrances of the noblest part of his nature. To delight in the law of God after the inner man, and yet in action, uniformly to serve the law of sin, is truly a "hyperbole" of wickedness. (See verse 13 in the original.) Moreover we affirm that, while the expressions, alleged as descriptive of Christian experience, are equally applicable to the exercises of convicted sinners, many of the opposite expressions, which describe the *sinful state* of the character in question, cannot, without manifest violence be applied to the experience of Christians. e. g. "I am carnal, sold under sin," &c. That we may have a general and comparative view of the strength of the expressions on the one side and the other, we place them in parallel columns.

MARKS OF A SINNER.	MARKS OF A SAINT.
"I am carnal, sold under sin. That which I do, I allow not. What I hate, that do I. I know that in me, (that is in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing. How to perform that which is good, I find not The	"I consent unto the law, that it is good. It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. To will is present with me. It is no more I that do it. but sin that dwelleth in me. I delight in the law

Digitized by Google

good that I would I do not. The evil that I would not, that I do. I find then a *law* that when I would do good evil is present with me, &c. bringing me into captivity to the law of sin. O! wretched man that I am, &c. With the flesh I serve the law of sin."	of God, after the inner man. I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. With the mind, I myself serve the law of God." *Note.* We place in this column all the expressions, which by any violence can be distorted into marks of Christian character.

II. The *form of the argument* of the passage, requires the interpretation we propose. Concerning the first half of the passage we have paraphrased, (from the 7th to the 13th verse,) all are agreed. No controversy arises till we come to the clause, "I am carnal, sold under sin." (14th verse.) Here the question presents itself, Does the apostle mean absolutely, according to the form of the expression, "I am *now*, while writing, (though a holy servant of God,) carnal, sold under sin? If so, the remainder of the passage may indeed describe the exercises of a Christian, and men may, by the example of the great apostle of Christianity, claim the character of holiness, while they acknowledge themselves carnal, and the bond slaves of sin. It is plain, the whole value of the hypothesis, which authorises this conclusion, depends on the form of the expression, "I *am* carnal." &c. It is said the use of the present tense confines the application of the expression

Digitized by Google

to Paul's present character. Here then we come to the point, on which the whole controversy turns. We are at issue concerning the *time*, to which Paul referred, when he said, "I am carnal". We alledge, before entering upon positive argument, as proof that the mere *form* of the expression determines nothing, the following passage. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I *am* the chief." 1 Tim. i. 15. Here the same apostle, who elsewhere calls God and man to witness the holiness of his life, 1 Thess. ii. 10. declares himself, if the use of the present tense necessarily respects present character, to be *now*, while writing to his own son in the faith, the *chief of sinners*. This will not be pretended; of course the argument from the mere form of expression is abandoned. Now then, if by any other means, we can ascertain the *time* to which Paul refers, when he says, "I am carnal." we settle the question concerning the interpretation of the whole passage: for the remaining language of the disputed paragraph is in immediate connexion with, and dependence on, this first expression

We resort then to the preceding context, to the chain of argument, of which, this expression constitutes a link. Observe ver. 14. is introduced with a causative, "*for*." It contains then a reason for some preceding truth. What is that truth? Obviously this. "The conse-

Digitized by Google

quence of the application of the law to my soul: while in the flesh, was death: yet the law was not in fault, for the law is wholly good. The procurement of this fatal result is attributable wholly to my own wickedness, the exceeding malignity of which is thus developed. (Here comes in the clause under consideration.) "For the law is spiritual, but I am carnal," &c. It is plain that the opposition, which existed, between the spiritual claims of the law, and the carnal condition of the person, whose case is described, is given as a reason, why death resulted from the application of the law. That opposition must have preceded the death which it wrought. The cause must precede the effect. We may paraphrase then the 9th verse, which is a summary statement of the whole matter in discussion, thus, "I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment, in its spirituality, came, the opposition of my carnal nature awoke, sin revived and I died, for the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin." The carnal nature and the captivity to sin then, of which he speaks in the 14th verse, preceded the death of which he speaks in the 9th verse. "I am carnal," means, if there is any logic in Paul's argument, "I *was* carnal, when I was alive without the law, before the commandment came, sin revived and I died." We need not go into an argument here, to prove that this was before his conversion. As the in

Digitized by Google

terpretation of the whole disputed passage, turns upon this point, we conclude the *argument* of it requires our interpretation.

Note. A shadow of an argument for the interpretation, which makes the expression, "I am carnal," descriptive of Paul as a Christian, has been drawn from a case of supposed analogy, in which, it is alledged. Paul calls *saints*, carnal (1 Cor. iii. 1—3) This is not the place for proving, as we might abundantly prove, that this allegation is untrue. It is sufficient for our present purpose, to deny that the charge, which Paul brings against the Corinthians, is, in any way, proof even of the probability that he himself was *carnal*. On the contrary, the very fact, that he rebuked the Corinthians for being carnal, is evidence, to those who believe the apostle a consistent Christian, that he was not chargeable with the same sin himself. If, in saying in the 7th of Romans, "I am carnal, sold under sin," the apostle described his own character and condition as a Christian, what could hinder the Corinthians from retorting, and that justly, his rebuke? "Physician heal thyself." "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." "You sharply rebuke us for external action, which you suppose to be proof that we are carnal, and yet, in your Epistle to the Romans, vii. 14., you say, without qualification, 'I am car-

Digitized by Google

nal, sold under sin.' We have better proof, in your own *confession*, that you are carnal, than you have in our *external actions*, that we are carnal," Moreover the context of the passage under consideration, most decisively proves, [if Paul's own words will be received as proof,] that he was *not carnal*. In the preceding chapter, 1 Cor. ii. 6 16. he declares that the wisdom, which he communicated to those who were perfect, was communicated to him by the Spirit of God, and was of such a nature, that it could be received, only by those who have the Spirit. He then contrasts the natural, with the spiritual man, exhibits the superiority of the spiritual man, in respect to understanding and authority of judgement, and claims that character for himself. "We have the mind of Christ," says he, i. e. "we are spiritual, being instructed by the Holy Ghost, and qualified to instruct even the perfect, and to judge and rebuke the carnal." "And," he proceeds, "I, bretheren, could not speak unto *you*, as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal," evidently claiming for himself, exemption from the charge, which he laid against those, whom he thus undertook to reprove.

111. The obvious *contrast* between the passage in question, [Rom. vii. 7—25.] and the description of the character and privileges of Christians, which follows it, in the 8th chapter, requires the interpretation we propose. Our argument is this.

Digitized by Google

It is acknowledged by all, that the 8th chapter describes the character and condition of Christians. We say, if this be true, the 7th describes one who is *not* a Christian, and this we show by a contrast of the passages, placed in parallel columns, as follows:

EIGHTH CHAPTER.	SEVENTH CHAPTER.
To be carnally minded is death. The carnal mind is enmity against God. They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit.	I am carnal, sold under sin.
The law of the spirit of life hath made me *free* from the law of sin and death. Ye have not received the spirit of *bondage* again to fear. What the law *could not* do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son, condemned sin in the flesh, that the *righteousness* of the law *might be fulfilled* in us.	I see a law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into *captivity* to the law of sin. I serve with the flesh the law of sin. To will is present with me, but how to *perform* that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do.
To be spiritually minded is life and peace. We know that *all* things work together for good to them that love God. We are more than conquerors, through him that hath loved us.	Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

Digitized by Google

The accounts then of the two characters stand thus. The man described in the 7th chapter is carnal, sold under sin, led captive by a *law*, that wars against his own conscience and the law of God, of course under condemnation, acting in every instance, contrary to the dictates of his own better nature, unutterably wretched.

The man described in the 8th chapter, is spiritually minded, not in the flesh, delivered from condemnation, free from the law of sin and death, having received, not the spirit of bondage, but of adoption, in Christ, fulfilling the righteousness of the law, enjoying life and peace, confident that *all* things work for his good, made *more than* conqueror through Christ.

One is dying, the other rising from the dead. One is dealing with the law in his own strength, the other is in Christ, who is "the end of the law." In other words, one is under law, the other under grace. One is a sinking sinner, the other, a conquering Christian.

The contrast is too obvious, on the face of the language of the two passages, to need further commentary, but we shall see more fully, in the following paragraph of our discussion, the design and bearing of this contrast, with reference to the general argument of the whole epistle.

IV. The *scope of the argument of the epistle* requires the interpretation we propose. The subject of the epistle is salvation by grace, the gos-

Digitized by Google

pel "the *power* of God to salvation, to every one that believeth," Christ our justification and *sanctification*, i. 16. As preliminary to an exhibition of the way of salvation, the apostle proves the depravity of Jews and Gentiles. i. 19—iii. 20. The atonement is then set forth, and shown to be consistent with support of law, as a ground of gratuitous justification. iii. 21–31. The relations of that faith, which is the condition of justification, are the subjects of the 4th chapter. In the 5th chapter, the apostle mentions the prominent blessings resulting from this mode of salvation peace, hope, patience, "the love of God, shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is *given to us*," (being the purchase of the blood of Christ, as truly as the pardon he bestows,) concluding with a contrast between the free gift of Christ, and the curse of Adam, in which he shows, that the gift surpasses the curse, of course that believers are more than reinstated in the condition of Adam before the fall. The 6th chapter begins with an inquiry concerning the moral tendency of this method of salvation, whether sin is consistent with the reception of the gift of grace? Having answered this question, by assuming, that the very profession of union to Christ, implies final death to sin, and resurrection to newness of life, in the 14th verse, the apostle exhibits the ground of the confidence, which believers possess, of deliverance from sin,

Digitized by Google

in the fact, that they are *not under law, but under grace*; their salvation depends, not on their own efforts to obey the law, but on the promised grace of God in Christ. He proceeds to draw the contrast between a state of sin, and a state of grace, making freedom from sin the test, by which men may know whether they are partakers of grace. ver. 16. His argument establishes this point: that *under the gospel, men are wholly sinful, or wholly righteous.* They that are servants of righteousness are free from sin, in like manner, as they that are the servants of sin are free from righteousness. ver. 18—20, &c. So that grace gives no licence to sin, for grace, if it gives any thing, gives *eternal life*, redemption from the curse and *power* of sin forever. In the first four verses of the 7th chapter, the apostle shows *how* men come out from under the law, and enter upon a state of grace, viz. by death, i. e. despair of salvation under the law. As a marriage contract binds the parties for life, so a man's relations to the law remain as long as he lives. Death only can divorce him from the law, and give him liberty of union to Christ. In the 5th verse, we have a brief statement of the condemning, fatal influence of a law system, upon men in the flesh. In the 6th verse, we have a parallel statement of the deliverance and blessing of a state of grace. The contrast first suggested in the 14th verse of the 6th chapter, between law and grace, is still

Digitized by Google

pursued, with a view to the developement of the truth then intimated, that the moral tendency of a *gracious*, is far better than that of a *legal* system. In the 7th verse, the apostle takes up the principle stated in the 5th, and in the remainder of the chapter, exhibits, in detail, the process by which the law, which was ordained unto life, becomes, through the wickedness of men, the instrument of death. In the 8th chapter, the idea suggested in the 6th verse of the 7th chapter, is resumed and fully developed. The saving, sanctifying power of the gospel system of grace is triumphantly exhibited; Christ fully set forth as our *sanctification*, as well as our justification.

Any one, who will dwell upon the general view of the argument of the epistle thus sketched, will see without perplexity, the place and bearing of the passage we have undertaken to expound. It stands in the midst of an argument for the superiority of grace to law, as a means of deliverance from sin; evidently constituting one side of the contrast between the two systems. The 8th chapter constitutes the other. On the one hand, we have the *law*, instead of giving sanctification and salvation, aggravating the wickedness, and securing the condemnation and death, of its subject. On the other hand, we have *grace* in Christ Jesus, giving liberty and life, righteousness and eternal redemption. The contrast is a commentary on the 14th verse of the 6th chapter, "Sin

Digitized by Google

shall not have dominion over you, *for* ye are not under law, but under grace."

To show the absurdity of that interpretation, which regards the man described in vii. 7–25, as a Christian, under that *grace* which delivers from the dominion of sin, we quote a single clause, [recommending a reperusal of the whole.] "I find a *law*, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Can it be imagined that the wretched man, who acknowledges himself, without qualification, the bond slave of sin, is under that *grace*, whose *sanctifying* power the apostle is endeavouring to recommend?

V. The intimations which Paul elsewhere gives, concerning his own moral character, are inconsistent with the interpretation, which regards the passage in question, as descriptive of his exercises as a Christian. In proof of this, we quote the following passages. "Herein do I exercise myself to have always, a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward man." Acts xxiv. 16. "In *all* things approving ourselves the ministers of God—by *pureness*, by the armor of righteousness, on the right hand, and on the left." 2 Cor. vi. 4—7. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God." Gal. ii. 20. "The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. Gal. vi. 14. "For me

Digitized by Google

to live is Christ." Phil. i. 21. "Brethren, be followers together of me—for our conversation is in heaven." Phil. iii. 17. 20. "I *can do all* things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Phil. iv. 13. [comp. Rom. vii. 18. How to *perform* that which is good, I find not."] "The Father hath made us *meet* to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness." Col. i. 12, 13. "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblamably we behaved ourselves among you." 1 Thess. ii. 19. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him." 2 Tim. i. 12. "I have fought a *good* fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." 2 Tim. iv, 7, &c.

If Paul could say these things of himself, and in the same breath declare, "I am carnal, sold under sin; how to perform that which is good, I find not; I find a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me," &c. &c., we confess we see no method, by which his consistency, or inspiration can be maintained.

Remarks. I. The interpretation which we have endeavored to present, and sustain, is by no means new. It is often alledged, in favor of the ordinary views of this, as of other passages, that they are the ancient and universal views of the Church. We will not dwell on the fallacy and

Digitized by Google

wickedness of such attempts to chain the Bible to tradition. But we deny the truth of the allegation. The early Fathers without exception, so far as is known, down till the 5th century, regarded Rom. vii. 7—25. as applicable, not to a Christian, but to an unregenerate man. Augustine first proposed the opposite interpretation, in the heat of a dispute with Pelagius, about natural depravity. He had himself accorded with the Fathers and church of the first ages of Christianity, in his views of the passage and he changed his interpretation, obviously to avoid defeat in an argument. Pelagius pressed him with the expressions, "I consent unto the law," "I delight in the law," &c. as proof of the existence of something morally good in the unregenerate man. We have seen, on the contrary, that these very expressions, in the mouth of one, who, in every instance, acts in opposition to the conviction which they disclose, prove him to be unutterably depraved, a "hyperbole of wickedness." So that Augustine, needlessly, as well as wickedly, resorted to an interpretation, which the consent of the Fathers, and his own common sense had before rejected. From him, this perversion of the word of God soon gained extensive authority, prevailed over Christendom during the darkness of the middle ages, and by tradition has come down to our day, with all its damnable influence, a time-honored suggestion of Satan. Since the dawn of

Digitized by Google

the reformation, many distinguished interpreters, from time to time, have returned to the original interpretation, and it is now the uniform testimony of *competent* biblical *students*, that Rom. vii. 7—25, describes the exercises of an unregenerate man.*

II. It is often alledged, in favor of the prevailing interpretation of Rom. vii. 7—25, that the passage actually describes the exercises of true Christians, whether the apostle designed such an application of it, or not. We deny again the truth of the allegation. We fully concede that the description is applicable to the exercises of those who are *accounted*, by themselves and others, true *Christians*: but it must be shown that they are so *in fact*, or the allegation cannot stand. How then shall we ascertain this point? By traditions of the church? By public opinion? By the *feelings* and *hopes* of the persons whose character is in question? Shall we, by any, or all of these tests, determine that they *are true Christians*, and then try the word of God by their exercises? Or shall we take the ground of the apostle;—"let God be true and every man a liar," and leaving traditions, public opinion, feelings and hopes, betake ourselves at once, and fearless-

* For the authorities on which this remark is founded, we refer to Stuart's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Excursus 4.

Digitized by Google

ly," to the word and the testimony," certainly believing, that there and there only, we shall find a legitimate standard of christian experience? In a word, shall we try the word of God by the exercises of supposed Christians, or their exercises by the word of God? For the benefit of those who regard the testimony of Jehovah, as paramount to the traditions, and opinions of *all* men, even of supposed saints, we cite the following passages, as presenting *his* standard of christian character.

"Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Mat. v. 19. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of my father in heaven." vii. 21. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that committeth sin is the servant of sin." John viii. 34. "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law are justified." Rom. ii. 13. "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe we shall also live with him, knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, *dieth no more*, death hath no more dominion over him; for in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth, unto God; likewise reckon yourselves to be *dead indeed* unto sin, but alive unto God." Rom. vi. 8–11. "When ye were the servants of sin, [comp. John viii. 34. "He

Digitized by Google

that *committeth sin* is the servant of sin."] ye were free from righteousness; but now being made free from sin, ye have your fruit unto holiness," &c. Rom. vi 20–22. If we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth." 1 John i. 6. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii. 4. Whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not, whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, neither known him—little children *let no man deceive you*; he that doeth righteousness, is righteous *even as he* is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. *In this* the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil, whosoever *doeth* not righteousness, is not of God." iii. 6–10.

In view of the standard presented in these declarations of the Most High, we say, without hesitation, the man who can adopt the language of Rom. vii. 7–25, as descriptive of his own exercises, *is not a Christian.* If he that doeth not righteousness is not of God, and hereby the children of the devil are manifest, surely the man who can say, "how to perform that which is good, I find not," is a child of the devil.

Finally—We believe the common perversion of the passage we have endeavoured to expound,

Digitized by Google

has done more for the ruin of the church and the damnation of souls, than any other single device of the adversaries of God. The supposed exclamation of the *Holy* Apostle, "O! wretched man that I am," &c, is the watch-word of wicked believers, the defensive talisman of all who roll sin as a sweet morsel under their tongues.

Digitized by Google

THE HOLINESS OF PAUL.

The God of this world is effectually blinding many minds, and preventing the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, from shining unto them, by furnishing them, *from God's own word*, with arguments against the manifest *object* of God, in that word, and in all his dealings with the children of men, viz. *holiness of heart*. It is almost universally taken for granted that the principle is laid down in the Bible, as absolute and immutable; that *perfect holiness can have no place in this world*, and this dogma of tradition, is sustained by the perpetual suggestion and quotation of such passages as the following. „There is not a just man upon earth, that liveth and sinneth not." "If I say, I am perfect, this also shall prove me perverse." "If we say, we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," &c. If, in reply to such suggestions, we say, the ordinary unqualified interpretation of these passages, denies the perfect holiness of Christ, the common rejoinder is, *Christ was not merely a man*, and for that reason, is an exception to the rule." We might still reply, "neither are Christ's brethren, *merely men*; as sons of God, members of the flesh and bones of Christ, they are partakers of the divine nature,

Digitized by Google

and are entitled to the same exemption with their Head," but waiving this advantage, we shall venture, for the benefit of those who doubt or deny that the Bible presents any other example of perfect holiness, than that of Jesus Christ, to attempt a vindication of his chief apostle, Paul, from the aspersions of those, who think he "walked after the flesh." In conducting his defence, we shall show, 1st, that he himself pleads "not guilty," to the charge of sin on which he is arraigned, 2d, that the evidence adduced against him, is utterly futile.

Under the first division of our argument, we shall adduce evidence, 1. That he boldly and explicitly, professed to be holy.

1 Thess. ii. 10 "Ye are witnesses and God also how *holily and justly, and unblamably* we behaved ourselves among you that believe." 2 Cor. vi. 3–7. *Giving no offence in any thing*, that the ministry be not blamed, but in *all things* approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in watchings, in fastings, by *pureness*, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of *righteousness on the right and on the left.*"

2 Cor. i. 12. "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in *simplicity and god-*

Digitized by Google

ly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world."

Acts xxiv, 16 "Herein do I exercise myself, *to have always a conscience void of offence, toward God, and toward man.*"

2 Tim. i. 3. "I thank God, whom I serve, from my forefathers with *a pure conscience*," &c.

2 Tim. iv. 7. "I have fought a *good* fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

2. He so identified himself with Jesus Christ, in speaking of his own state, as to *imply, either that he was perfectly holy, or Christ was a sinner.* Gal. ii. 20. "*I am crucified with Christ*, nevertheless I live, yet *not I, but Christ liveth in me*, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God."

Gal. vi. 14. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, *by whom the world is crucified to me, and I unto the world.*"

Phil. i. 21. "For me *to live is Christ.*"

3. *He constantly justified his conduct*, amidst all the accusations of his enemies, and *no instance can be shown wherein he acknowledged himself guilty.*

Acts xx. 18–27. Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you *at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind*, and with many tears

Digitized by Google

and temptations which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews; and how I kept back nothing that was profitable to you, &c. And now behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God shall see my face no more, wherfore I take you to record this day, that *I am pure of the blood of all men*, for I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God.

2 Cor. x. 2–6. I beseech of you that I may not be bold when I am present, with that confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against *some, which think of us, as if we walked according to the flesh; for though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh*, &c. casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, *and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ*, (i. e. in himself, see the original,) *and having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience*, &c.

We give only a specimen of the evidence, which might be adduced under this head. See further, 2 Cor. i 17—20. ii. 17. 1 Thess. ii. 1 11. &c.

4. *He held up his own example, without qualification, for the imitation of the churches*; of course, if he was not perfectly holy, the Bible presents two standards of obedience. Christ says, by word and example, "be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." Paul says,

Digitized by Google

"Be ye followers of *me*." If the last direction be not identical with the first, whom shall we follow, Christ or Paul? *If it be identical, Paul was perfectly holy.*

1 Cor. iv. 16. "I beseech you, *be ye followers of me*, for this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, *who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ.*"

1 Cor. xi. 1. "*Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.*"

Phil. iii. 17–20. Brethren, *be followers together of me*, and mark them which walk so, as *ye have us for an ensample*, &c. for our citizenship (see the original) is in heaven."

Phil. iv. 9. Those things which ye have both learned and received, and heard and *seen in me*, do, and the God of peace shall be with you."

Acts xxiv. 29. "And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and *altogether such as I am*, except these bonds."

5. *His discourses constantly take for granted, that Christians do not commit sin*, of course, by implication they deny that he was a sinner.

Rom. vi. 2. "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?"

1 Cor. xv. 34. "Awake to righteousness, *and sin not.*"

2 Cor. xii. 20, 21. "I fear, lest when I come

Digitized by Google

again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail *many that have sinned already.*'

2 Cor. xiii. 2. "I write to them, which *heretofore have sinned*, and to all other, that if I come again, I will not spare."

Col. i. 12. "Giving thanks to the Father, which *hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.*"

2 Tim. i. 9. "Who *hath saved us*, and called us with a *holy* calling."

Titus ii. 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us *from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*

Sum of the evidence—1. Paul explicitly declared himself to be holy. 2. He declared his identity with Christ, in whom is no sin. 3. He constantly asserted his own integrity of conduct, without once acknowledging a fault. 4. He held himself up as a perfect example for the imitation of believers. 5. His discourses constantly imply that in professing to be a Christian, he was not a sinner.

So much for the proposition that the apostle pleads "not guilty." As it is a right rule of all judicial proceedings, in which personal character is impeached, that the defendant pleading "not guilty," shall be considered innocent till his guilt is proved, we are now prepared to meet and examine the testimony of his accusers. We shall show by separately noticing the several charges

Digitized by Google

commonly preferred against him, that the evidence for his impeachment is utterly futile.

1. *His contention with Barnabas.* The account of this affair stands thus: "Some days after, Paul said unto Barnabas, let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of God, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other: and so Barnabas took Mark and sailed unto Cyprus. And Paul chose Silas and departed, being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God." Acts xv. 36—40.

We observe upon this, in the first place, that there is no certain evidence that either Paul or Barnabas sinned. A mere difference of judgment, wisely permitted for the purpose of separating them, may have been perfectly consistent with *unity of heart.* "The contention was so sharp between them [not that they abused each other with words or blows, but] that they departed asunder one from the other," and probably by mutual consent, in peace. But we observe further, that so far as there is any probable proof that either sinned, it goes to impeach the charac-

Digitized by Google

ter of Barnabas only. This John, about whom the contention arose, was Barnabas' nephew, (see Col. iv. 10.) who doubtless was influenced by partiality for him, as his kinsman, and "*determined* to take him with them," without first consulting Paul, or heeding his counsel afterwards. No reason is given for Barnabas' determination, whereas Paul "thought it not good" to take John, *because he had once, through fear or indolence, deserted them.* It is plain that Paul acted conscientiously in the matter: Barnabas, also, seems to have been foremost in effecting the separation. He first "took Mark and sailed to Cyprus," apparently, almost without waiting to bid his brethren farewell; whereas Paul deliberately "chose Silas and departed, being recommended to the grace of God by the brethren," who evidently approved the course he had taken in the affair. Nothing but malice or carelessness can discover the least evidence in these circumstances that Paul departed from integrity, while candor finds fresh proof of his wisdom and firmness.

5. *His anathema upon the high priest.* Acts xxiii. 1–5. "Paul, earnestly beholding the council, said, Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day. And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. Then saith Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall; for sittest thou to judge me after

Digitized by Google

the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not brethren, that he was the high priest, for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of my people."

There was manifestly no sin in the mistake which Paul made respecting the official character of his abuser. He acknowledged no *sin*, though he showed a perfect and manly readiness to acknowledge a mistake, as well as a conscientious self-possession, in quoting scripture for the acknowledgment. The chief question is, have we evidence that he was *sinfully* angry in this affair? Admitting that his words bespeak anger, we assert that he was not "angry *without a cause*." The unrighteous conduct of the high priest called for righteous indignation. Anger is not in every case sinful (see Mark iii. 5—Eph. iv. 26.) Paul's accusers must therefore show that he was *unreasonably* angry. This cannot be shown from his language in the case. He neither smote the high priest, nor threatened to smite him *himself*. "*God* shall smite thee, thou whited wall." Is this an expression of a revengeful spirit? It was only a calm and true prediction of the righteous judgment of God. He used the language of Christ in the severe appellation which he gave the high priest. (See Mat. xxiii. 27.) He did not avenge himself, but recognized the

Digitized by Google

truth, that vengeance is the Lord's. There is less evidence of a vindictive spirit in this case, than in many expressions which we might select from his writings, where confessedly sinful anger had no influence. e. g. "I would that they were even cut off that trouble you." Galatians v. 12. "Alexander the copper-smith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works." 2 Tim. iv. 14, &c. The charge cannot be sustained.

3. *His supposed confession in the 7th chapter of Romans.* For a refutation of this charge, we refer to the last article in our third number, only remarking here that it is well for those who make or endorse this charge, that Paul himself is not among them; for in his life time he most unsparingly scourged those who regarded him as walking "according to the flesh," and he might well have included them all in his anathema of Alexander; "*They have done me much evil*: the Lord reward them according to their works."

4. *His temptation by the thorn in his flesh.* 2. Cor. xii. 7. "Lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh; a messenger of Satan, to buffet me; lest I should be exalted above measure." Shall we infer from this passage that the apostle sinned? Rather shall we not infer that God, who had undertaken his salvation from sin, *prevented him from sin.*

Digitized by Google

ning, by suffering Satan to humble him?

The words which immediately follow this passage, show that the apostle was not the less perfect for being the subject of infirmities and temptations. "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me, and he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for *my strength is made perfect in weakness*. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather *glory in my infirmities*, that the power of Christ may rest upon me."

5. *His denial that he was perfect.* Phil. iii. 12, 13. We quote the passage with its context: "I count all things but loss, &c. that I may know him, (Christ) and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death: if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth to those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect be thus minded; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

We observe 1. Two kinds of perfection are

Digitized by Google

here spoken of, one of which Paul *had* already attained. "Not as though I had already attained, or were already *perfect*."—Let us, therefore, as many as be *perfect*, &c. We must not, therefore, take for granted, that in denying that he was perfect, he referred to his moral character, but must determine by the context the nature of that perfection which he had *not* attained. 2. The context satisfactorily shows, that the imperfection which Paul acknowledged was *not* imperfection of moral character. He had in his mind the *glorified state* of Christ, as the prize of his high calling, and looking at the course by which Christ had attained that state, he perceived and acknowledged that he had not yet run the whole race. "Not as though I had already attained"—what? Perfect holiness? No—but the *resurrection of the dead*: Christ attained that by suffering and death, accordingly Paul "counted all things but loss," that he "might know *the fellowship of his sufferings*, being made *conformable to his death*," that he might have fellowship with his resurrection and glory. Paul was striving to attain the perfection of Christ, by the way in which *Christ attained it*. Thirty years before Paul wrote this passage, Christ himself might have said in the same sense, "Not as though I had already attained, either was already perfect"—and this he did virtually say in the words following: "Go, tell that fox, behold I cast out devils, and I

Digitized by Google

do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day *I shall be perfected.*" Luke xiii. 32. Paul informs us *how* Christ was perfected, in the following passages: "It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation *perfect through sufferings.*" Heb. ii. 10. "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the *things which he suffered*; and being made *perfect*, he became the author of eternal salvation." Heb. v. 8, 9. Before his death, Christ, like Paul, was pressing toward the mark for the prize of his high calling. "I have a baptism," says he, "to be baptized with, and *how am I straightened till it be accomplished.*" Luke xii. 50. Christ was not perfect till he had fully suffered, died, risen, and entered into his glory. Yet was he not *perfectly holy*? So Paul had "not attained," was not "perfect," had "not apprehended that for which he was apprehended of Christ," had not reached "the prize of his high calling," so long as he fell short of full fellowship with the sufferings, death, resurrection and glory of Christ; but in acknowledging this, he by no means confessed himself a sinner. If Christ was holy before he was made perfect by suffering, Paul might be holy before he had reached full "fellowship with his sufferings" If Christ was holy before he became obedient unto death, Paul might be holy before he was made "conformable

Digitized by Google

unto his death." If Christ was holy before he rose from the dead, Paul might be holy before he had "attained the resurrection of the dead." If Christ was holy before he was "perfect," Paul might be holy before he was "perfect." Moreover, immediately subsequent to the passage in question, Paul proposes his spiritual state as *an example of perfection*, earnestly exhorting the Philippians to imitate him, declaring himself already a citizen of the celestial world. Thus he asserted his perfect holiness, while he acknowledged the distance which yet lay between him and the goal of his race, the prize of his high calling, the perfection of his glorified Master.

If there be other charges against Paul, besides those we have noticed, they have not come to our ears. By the trial thus far, he stands clear of all just causes of impeachment. We have shown that he pleads "not guilty," and that the accusations of his enemies are calumnious falsehoods. Until further evidence of his guilt shall be produced, he must be fully acquitted, and declared *an example of perfect holiness*. We cannot but remark, before closing his defence, that he has been abusively, if not wantonly, slandered. Not content with persecuting and defaming him during his life time, his accusers have ever since been striving to blacken his memory, transmitting the work of slander from generation to generation, until at this day, all Christendom verily believes

Digitized by Google

—what few dared to insinuate while he lived—that he "walked according to the flesh." We trust justice will yet be done to his character, and that the churches which now slander him as a Christian, while they worship him as a man, will yet "glorify God in him."

NOTE.

The latest and boldest attack upon the character of Paul has been made, since the first publication of these articles in his defence. The editor of the Perfectionist, the endorser * and publisher of these very articles, subsequently became a very forward abettor of those who "think of Paul as if he walked after the flesh," as may be seen by reading an article in the 4th No. of the 2d Vol. on "being made all things to all men." We shall make such extracts from this article as are neccessary in order to present to view the main points of the accuser, subjoining such remarks as their refutation requires.

* In No. 1. of the 2d Vol. of the Perfectionist, in reply to an objector, who urged the 7th chapter of Romans against the doctrine of holiness, the editor says——"Will he also read the dissertation on the 7th chapt. of Rom. in the third No. Vol. 1. in which the carnality of Paul as a Christian is overthrown."

And again——"When he has mastered all these difficulties, will he prepare to meet that "confidence, wherewith" the slandered Paul "thought to be bold against some, who thought of him as though he *walked according to the flesh?*"

Digitized by Google

After quoting 1. Cor. ix. 19—22. the passage in which Paul states that he was "made all things to all men," the editor proceeds thus:

"1. We believe that the principle presented in this passage is the dictate of the merest worldly wisdom, and that the apostle Paul, in adopting and acting upon it, committed one of the greatest errors of his life.

It was in obedience to this principle that he *circumcised* Timothy; the very thing which afterward he most pointedly and unsparingly condemned in the Galatians. See Gal. v. 2. vi. 12.——

It was in accordance with this same principle of double dealing, that he complied with the wishes of the legalist James and his temporizing elders, when he last visited Jerusalem, by taking upon him the vow of a Nazarite, shaving his head, &c.——And did he accomplish any thing at which he aimed by thus seeking to please the Jews? no, never.——

We do not believe that the spirit of God ever led Paul to comply with the request of James and his Jewish elders, nor to circumcise Timothy, nor to make himself all things to all men: though we doubt not, he was inspired to give the account of himself, contained in the passage under consideration, in the same way that he was to give a history of his madness and cruelty as a Persecutor.——

The man who abominates Judaism as much as Paul did, and yet puts on the *exterior* of Judaism—plays a double game, possesses a double character, and practices the odious part of the detestable Jesuit. Now we do not believe, that God is in such want of means, or so put to it for measures, or influences to save men, as to render it necessary for him to resort to trickery, to pious frauds, to carnal management, or double dealing of any kind, to accomplish his wishes. We cannot believe, that God ever set Paul, or any

Digitized by Google

other man to work in any such Jesuitical, back-handed way as this. It is infinitely beneath him."

The substance of the charges preferred in these extracts may be stated thus: In being made all things to all men, Paul 1st was *dishonest*, 2d was *inconsistent*, 3d was *not led by the Spirit*. We will examine these charges in their order.

I. Was Paul *dishonest?* That he obeyed the injunction of Christ, "*be ye wise as serpents*," and thus became preeminently, what Christ promised to make his disciples, "*a fisher of men*" we have no doubt. His preeminent success proves it. But he must be but a crude moralist, who sees no distinction between the honest ingenuity of benevolence, commended and exemplified by Christ and the lying subtleties of selfish men. In the simple act of conforming to the customs and ceremonies of the Jews, Paul manifestly violated no rule, either of his own or of divine morality. "Neither circumcision availeth anything nor *uncircumcision*, but faith that worketh by love,"—is a rule, uttered by Paul and sanctioned by the whole tenor of the New Testament, which left him at liberty to conform or not, as he chose, and by this rule, they who condemn his conformity are as truly legalists as they who condemn his non-conformity, since they evidently think *uncircumcision* availe something. To the moralist of the gospel, external modes are but the garments of character, and are no more matters of conscience than a change of dress. Paul then was not dishonest with *himself*.

Neither did he deceive *others*. The supposition implied thoughout the article under consideration, that in conforming to the external modes of those among whom he taught he had in view the cowardly and impracticable object of disguising himself and concealing his sentiments, is refuted by the tokens

of consummate wisdom and boldness which mark the whole history of his apostleship. When did he ever shrink from confessing himself a heretic? Rather when did he *not* boldly proclaim his hated faith?

A single specimen of his testimony will exhibit at once the honesty of his practice, and the true object of his conformity. In his defence before Felix, he says,——"Thou mayest understand that there are yet but twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem to worship. And they neither found me in the temple disputing with any man, neither raising up the people, neither in the synagogues, nor in the city: neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me. *But this I confess unto ther, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers.*"

Let it be observed that Paul is here speaking of the very visit to Jerusalem, in which he "complied with the wishes of the legalist, James." He based his defence on those very instances of conformity to Judaism, which the editor of the Perfectionist so recklessly condemns as Jesuitical and useless. It is manifest, first, that the apostle *did* obtain his object in that conformity, which was, *not* to avoid the fury of the people by disguising himself, but to make proof that he was an orderly and peaceable man, by which he might disarm his accusers, as he did before Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and many other Roman and Jewish potentates; and secondly, that the attainment of that object was perfectly consistent with an honest confession of heresy. Instead of seeking to deceive, he aimed to frustrate the falsehoods of his enemies who were ever ready to represent him as a dangerous, fanatical agitator. The meaning of his conformity was, not "I am a *Jew*," for he made all men to know that he was a Nazarene, but "I am a peaceable man, willing to comply with the requisitions of the society with which I deal, so far as they are harmless, for

Digitized by Google

'the sake of teaching the people that gospel which will redeem them from their 'vain conversation.'" Nonconformity would have proclaimed him "a pestilent fellow," a "mover of sedition," *which was not true*. By conforming therefore, he manifested, instead of concealing, the truth.

The combination of the "wisdom of the serpent," with the "harmlessness of the dove," which is manifest in Paul's character, is so rare, that the charge of dishonesty is not strange. In fact, it is an old accusation, noticed by Paul himself, Rom. iii. 8. Yet a careful and candid observer will discover in every instance as in the above, that he is "*slanderously reported*" by those who affirm that he said "let us do evil that good may come," and that their "damnation is just." Paul thus testified of himself—"We have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." This testimony must stand till better evidence of its falsehood appears.

II. Was Paul *inconsistent?* He circumcised Timothy, and yet rebuked the Galatians for cleaving to circumcision. He submitted to Jewish ordinances and yet withstood Peter for Judaising. We admit the facts, but deny the conclusion, for the following reasons. 1. In the case of the Galatians, his rebuke was manifestly aimed——not against the *outward act* of circumcision, for twice in the epistle to the Galatians, and once in immediate connection with his rebuke, he insists upon the rule to which we have already referred, "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by love," but——against *legality*, a disease of the *inner* man. He blamed the Galatians, not for doing what he did, viz. circumcising as a matter of expediency,

Digitized by Google

for the furtherance of the gospel, but *for* circumcising as a matter of conscience, *in obedience to the law*.

2. In the case of Peter, he likewise rebuked, not *outward acts*, but the dissembling and fearful *spirit*. This may easily be seen by reading Gal. ii. 12—14. The difference between Paul's conduct and Peter's may be stated thus: Paul submitted to ordinances for the *Lord's* sake: Peter, for *his own* sake. Paul was moved by *love*, the motive of the gospel: Peter, by *fear*, the motive of the law. Paul was *honest*: Peter *dissembled*. Paul imposed no *constraint* upon others, but he asks Peter, "why *compellest* thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Paul wisely sought to win them that were *without*: Peter foolishly gave place to false doctrines *within the church*. Thus it appears that although they did the same thing, the objects, motives, circumstances, and of course, moral character of their acts were totally different. Now unless Paul can be convicted of the folly of attaching moral character to external actions, a folly which he, more than all others, laboured to exterminate, he must be cleared of the charge of condemning in Peter, what he allowed in himself.

The truth is, that in both the preceding cases, as in all others, Paul was true to his rule——"neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by love,"——and rebuked neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, but the lack of faith, whether manifested by legality, as in the case of the Galatians, or by dissimulation, as in the case of Peter. He will be charged with inconsistency only by those who judge him by the outward appearance, and are too hasty, or too hostile to scrutinize the motives of his actions and the qualities of his spirit.

III. Was Paul *not led by the Spirit?* As we have shown that there was no dishonesty or inconsistency

Digitized by Google

in the principle for which he has been condemned, all the evidence that he was led by the Spirit in any of his conduct, is evidence, that he was led by the Spirit in adopting and acting upon this principle. The same wisdom which dictated the conduct of Christ, in charging the subjects of his miracles *not to make him known*, might without stooping an "infinite" depth, teach Paul to walk softly in his perilous conflicts with irritable prejudices; and he must be a very careless reader of the Bible, who cannot discover in the history of Abraham, Jacob, David, and indeed of the whole Jewish nation, traces of heavenly wisdom as near akin to "carnal management," as any thing in the works of Paul. The same spirit of confusion which sees no distinction between the contrivances of benevolence, and the subtleties of Satan, in condemning Paul for "being made all things to all men that he might save some," virtually condemns God the Father and the Son for devising and adopting the plan of redemption. For what was the work of Christ—but *being made a man that he might save men?* By the judgment of this adversary the incarnation itself, is but a "back-handed, Jesuitical piece of carnal management!"

Paul evidently represents himself in the very passage in question, as being led by the Spirit: "*I am made*," says he, (not "I make myself,") "all things to all men." By whom was he made? His answer is—"Our sufficiency is of *God*, who also *hath made* us able ministers of the New Testament." 2 Cor. iii 5. "By the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all, *yet not I but the grace of God which was with me.*" 1 Cor. xv. 10. Observe that the last passages were written to the Corinthians, as well as the first. Observe also that he *boasts* of his "being made all things to all men."

Digitized by Google

His mention of it is introduced in an argument of self defence and commendation. The Corinthians must therefore have understood him, as ascribing his conduct to the grace of God. Now as the editor admits that he was *inspired* to give this account of the matter, it follows that either he was inspired to give a *lying* account of the matter,—instead of abasing himself, as when he speaks of his madness as a persecutor, to boast of his own wickedness, and represent God as the father of it!—or he *was* led by the Spirit according to his own representation.

The rest of the article which occasioned these remarks, needs but little comment. The dictatorial loftiness with which the editor sits in judgment upon the principles and conduct of one, who declared himself, and was declared by God, to be above all human judgment, would be truly comical, if it were not truly detestable. He concludes with a retracting paragraph, fitted to the feelings of those, who might still retain some respect for the integrity of Paul—thus furnishing a truly dishonest illustration of the very principle which he labored to condemn. This "double dealing," however, will hardly divert the minds of discerning readers from the plain fact, that he has represented Paul as a SINNER, and in so doing like an Arnold, has attempted to surrender the strongest fortress of the cause he had espoused.

Digitized by Google

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PROFESSOR OF RELIGION AND AN IMPENITENT SINNER.

Professor. Friend, do you know that you are a sinner?

Sinner. Yes, I suppose I am.

Professor. I advise you then to repent at once; God commands you to repent on pain of eternal death.

Sinner. I do repent as often as I sin.

Professor. But do you forsake your sins? If not, your repentance is the sorrow of the world that worketh death.

Sinner. I cannot say indeed, that I forsake my sins, but I hope to become a Christian before I die.

Professor. Ah, your hope is "the hope of the wicked," that shall be cut off. You can have no security that you will ever become a Christian at some future time. *Now* is the day of salvation. You may as well trust a spider's web for salvation, as a death-bed repentance.

Sinner. But I must wait God's time; for without him I can do nothing. It seems to me that I *cannot* repent.

Professor. Then you say God is a tyrant, inasmuch as he commands you to do what you cannot do.

Sinner. I will not say that; but my heart is

Digitized by Google

desperately hard; I have no inclination to repent.

Professor. That is your own fault, and instead of being an excuse for your impenitence, is the greatest aggravation of your wickedness, and the very reason why you should repent at once.

Sinner. After all, supposing I repent and become a Christian, how much better will be my case? Let me ask if you are not a sinner still?

Professor. Not in the sense in which you are.

Sinner. But you commit sin; are you not therefore in proper language a sinner?

Professor. Yes I commit sin, I am a sinner. Nobody lives without sin. But I am not an impenitent sinner, I repent as often as I sin.

Sinner. But you confess you do not forsake your sins; and you told me a little while ago, that repentance without forsaking of sin, is the sorrow of the world that worketh death.

Professor. I do, as far as I can, forsake sin. My purpose is not to sin. I abhor myself when I violate this purpose. Sin is that which above all things, I hate, and desire and strive to avoid.

Sinner. You say then, you *cannot* obey the commands of God, though you desire and strive for it? According to your decision a while ago, this looks like making God a tyrant.

Professor. You misunderstand me; I do not mean to say I cannot obey the commands of God,

Digitized by Google

but the hearts of Christians, even the best of them, in this world, are deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.

Sinner. That is, you have no *inclination* to live without sin, though you confess your ability. If my memory serves me, you said not long since, that this was no excuse for wickedness, but an aggravation of it, and the very reason for immediate repentance.

Professor. I confess I have no excuse for my sins; I can only cast myself on the mercy of Christ.

Sinner. Will Christ save a man that is living in sin without excuse?

Professor. No: but I hope I am getting the victory over my sins, and shall at last be sanctified.

Sinner. When do you hope to be sanctified?

Professor. At death.

Sinner. If I understand you then, you have no hope of being saved without being finally sanctified; and you expect to be sanctified on your death-bed. Now this is just my hope and expectation, as I mentioned to you not long since. You said I might as well trust a spider's web for salvation, as a death-bed repentance.

Professor. After all, there is a difference between my case and yours. I have made my peace with God, you have not; I am justified, though not sanctified.

Digitized by Google

Sinner. Here then we have at last found the secret of your religion. Jesus Christ has pardoned you and given you a licence to sin, or at least a warrant of indemnity, while I am under condemnation. We are both sinners; we both repent as often as we sin; we both feel that the difficulty of forsaking our sins almost amounts to an impossibility; we both hope to be sanctified at last, and saved forever. But for the present you have a licence to sin, and I have none. Whether your case is better than mine, or not, one thing is certain, you are making Christ a minister of sin, which I dare not do. I advise you to look about yourself, for it seems to me you are in greater danger of hell than I am, inasmuch as you have had more light, and yet remain a grievous sinner.

Digitized by Google

OBJECTIONS.

The Bible is the magazine which furnishes nearly all the objections which are urged against the doctrine of holiness of heart; and when for the thousandth time, each individual objection has been set aside, we are uniformly met at last with the sweeping reply, "You can prove any thing you please from the Bible, by ingenuity of selection and interpretation." We always rejoice when the discussion reaches this issue: we rejoice in the concession of the reply, and repeat it; ingenuity can prove any thing from the Bible; Universalists find Universalism on every page; Unitarians, Unitarianism; Antinomians, Antinomianism; and sinful saints, imperfection. Such being the state of the case, the necessity arises of searching independently, for some unvarying principle, by which an honest man may be safely guided in his track through the materials of so many discordant creeds. Such a principle we find in the following statement; *The object of the writer*—assuming his consistency, is ordinarily the best guide to the interpretation of doubtful language. Assuming then the consistency of God in his communications to man, what is the grand object of his word? We answer, *holiness*. Is it too

Digitized by Google

much then to assert at once, that the Bible contains nothing which, by legitimate interpretation, can be used to contravene that object, by relieving men of pressure to present and perfect holiness? We think not, and by virtue of some experience in the investigation of God's word, we freely engage at any hazard, that the man who will make holiness the pole star of his course through that word, shall find plainer sailing than he can in any other direction. Go to the writings of God with the mind of God, and you shall find nothing inconsistent with the will of God, which is "your sanctification." "If any man will do his (the Father's) will, he shall know of the doctrine," &c. John vii. 17.

But more specifically. The Old Testament is the grand armory of those who set themselves in array against the object of God and of his word; the sanctification of man. The appeal is perpetually made to the examples of sinful saints, under the Jewish dispensation. In reply, we quote the following passages, characterizing the dispensation under which we live, and distinguishing it from its predecessor.

Matt. iii. 11, &c. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, &c. he shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost* and with fire; whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, &c.

Digitized by Google

John vii. 37, &c. Jesus stood and cried, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this he spake of the Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive,) for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.

John xv. 22. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sins.

Gal. iv. 3—6. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world, but when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman. made under the law, to redeem them that were under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying Abba, Father.

Heb. vii. 16. The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by he which we draw near to God.

Heb. viii. 8–10. Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, *because they continued not in my covenant*, and I regarded them

Digitized by Google

not, saith the Lord. This is the covenant that I will make with Israel after those days, saith the Lord, *I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts*, &c.

Heb. ix. 8. The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.

Heb. x. 19. Having therefore, breth en, boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus, by a *new and living* way, let us draw near, &c.

Heb. xi. 39–40. These all, (i. e. Old Testament saints,) having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

1 Pet. i. 9, &c. Receiving the end of your faith, the salvation of your souls, of which salvation the prophets have enquired, &c. unto whom it was revealed that *not unto themselves*, but *unto us*, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, &c.

Matt. xi. 11, 12. Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it

Digitized by Google

by force. John the Baptist and Jesus and his disciples had begun to preach "the kingdom of heaven"—the new dispensation "is at hand," and men were already rushing into it, as it would seem, prematurely. At this spot, Christ turns and raises a rampart behind him, for the very purpose of checking a future recurrence, to the examples of the Old Testament for comparisons, by declaring that the man who should rise no higher than John the Baptist, than whom a greater had not risen before him, could not claim to be the least in the coming dispensation.

In view of these, and a multitude of similar passages, we are authorized to say, that the use which is ordinarily made of the examples of Jewish saints, in expelling holiness from Christianity, developes folly or dishonesty, like that of a man who should excuse himself for falling at noon-day, by the example of one who stumbled at midnight; or of one who should justify the present daily use of ardent spirits, by appealing to the practice of respectable men before the temperance reformation; or of one who should palliate the commission of sin in heaven, by recurrence to the lives of professors of religion on earth.

Digitized by Google

THE SECOND COMING OF THE SON OF MAN.

On almost every page of the New Testament we find the second coming of Christ held up as the central beacon light of the hopes of believers, an event which should bring them a perfect, secure, and glorious redemption. We select the following passages as specimens of a multitude of expressions relating to that event.

"Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory: and when these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke xxi. 26, 27. "Our conversation is in Heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, and make it like unto his glorious body." Phil. iii. 20. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 4. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but to all that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 8. "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." Tit. ii. 13. "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin

Digitized by Google

unto salvation." Heb. xi. 28. "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord —behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain: be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." James v. 7, 8. "Gird up the loins of your mind—be sober and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. i. 13. "We know when he shall appear we shall be like him." 1 John iii. 2, &c.

The glorious event which thus animated the faith of primitive believers, as marking the period of the perfection of their faith, and their entrance upon the possession of the fulness of the gift of God's grace, though seemingly nigh at hand at that time, is at this day generally thrown forward, in the faith of the churches, into the shadows of a distant and indefinite futurity. Our object in the present article, is to call the attention of those who love the word of God more than creeds, to the testimony of that word concerning the *time* of the second coming of the Son of Man.

There is not, perhaps, a truth in the New Testament, so explicitly, so solemnly and so repeatedly announced, as this—*that the Son of Man should come within the generation cotemporary with Christ.* Without noticing a multitude

Digitized by Google

of passages wherein this truth is indirectly recognized, we cite the following explicit statements: "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." Mat. x. 23. "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here that shall not taste death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." Mat. xvi. 27, 28. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken, and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory; and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree: when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh. So, likewise, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but

Digitized by Google

my words shall not pass away." Mat. xxiv. 29. 35. (Compare Mat. xiii. 24.–31, and Luke xxi. 27–33.) "The Lord is at hand." Phil. iv. 5. "Yet a little while, and he that shall come will come and will not tarry." Heb. x. 37. "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh." James v. 8. "The end of all things is at hand". 1 Pet. iv. 7.

While the distance of the event was thus decisively limited, the *precise* time of its occurence, it must be admitted, was designedly left in uncertainty. This appears in such language as the following: "Ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." Mat. xxiv. 42. "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels in heaven, neither the son, but the Father." Mark xiii. 32. "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." Acts i. 7. "Of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you; for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." 1st Thess. v. 1, 2. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night." 2 Pet. iii. 10. "If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come on thee." Rev. iii. 3, &c. Yet a multitude of events were plainly predicted as the precursors of that day, by which believers might know his approach as surely as they could foreknow the coming of

Digitized by Google

summer by the budding of the fig tree. Wars, famines, pestilences, earthquakes, portentous signs in the earth, sun moon, and stars, blood and fire, and vapor of smoke, tribulations unutterable, distress of nations, men's hearts failing them for fear, great apostasies and damnable delusions, were uniformly foretold as the tokens of the coming of the great day of God. The history of the dying throes of the Jewish Theocracy records the actual appearance of most of these tokens within the generation cotemporary with Christ. The New Testament itself declares the fulfilment of the predictions concerning apostasies and delusions. For instance, the words of Christ, "Many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many; and because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold," (Mat. xxiv. 11, 12,) found their fulfilment in the life time of the apostle John, as appears from the following passages: "Many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John iv. 2. "Many deceivers are entered into the world." 2 John 7. "Thou hast left thy first love." Rev. ii. 4. "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead." Rev. iii. 1. "Thou art neither cold nor hot." Rev. iii. 15, &c.

Again, Christ predicted that false Christs should arise, and should show great signs and wonders. Paul repeats the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii. 1–12, where he warns believers against look-

Digitized by Google

ing for the coming of the day of God prematurely, assuring them that the man of sin was yet to be revealed, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders." John also records the fulfilment of these predictions. "Little children," said he, "it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists." 1 John ii. 18. "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is in the world." 1 John iv. 3. "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; this is a deceiver and an Antichrist." 2 John 7. We know, then, by the appearance of the fore-running tokens, as well as by the express and solemn words of Christ, that within the life time of John, the coming of the Son of Man was "nigh even at the doors;" and this well accords with the implication contained in Christ's words to Peter, John xxi. 22: "If I will that he (John) tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Adding to these considerations the fact that Christ repeatedly in his predictions, connected his coming with "the end of the world"—i. e. the termination of the Jewish Theocracy—we affirm that the concurrent and decisive testimony of Scripture:

Digitized by Google

leaves no way of escape from the conclusion, that *the second coming of the Son of Man was coincident with, or immediately subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem.*

A mind once fixed in this conclusion, naturally and properly hastens to survey its consequences. Before proceeding, however, a step in the examination, we must solemnly protest against that fluctuating distrust of the plain declarations of the word of God, which suffers startling consequences to shake inevitable conclusions. Unless we abandon all valuable confidence in that word, we must take our stand in fearless faith on its assertions, though they give all the traditions and creeds of eighteen centuries to the winds.

The first rush of inferences that follows our conclusion, may be stated thus: If the Son of Man came at the destruction of Jerusalem, he came "in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory"—"in flaming fire with his mighty angels"—"descending with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God" summoning the dead from their graves, separating the righteous from the wicked, and dispensing from the throne of his glory the immutable awards of the last judgment. "How can these things be?" "Where is the historical evidence that these mighty events transpired at the close of the Jewish dispensation?" We reply, the state of mind

Digitized by Google

which demands historical confirmation of the word of God, which refers the language of its predictions concerning the coming of the Son of Man to the outward world, instead of that kingdom "which cometh not with observation," which seeks visible and tangible evidence of their fulfilment, is doubtless the very state of mind which originated the delusion on this subject, and has transmitted it from generation to generation till our day. Christ and his apostles forewarned believers of the danger of delusion from this source. "If any man shall say unto you, lo here is Christ, or lo there, believe it not; for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they should deceive the very elect. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, behold he is in the desert, go not forth; behold he is in the secret chambers, believe it not; for as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." Mat. xxiv. 23—27. "When he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation (or outward show,) neither shall they say lo here or lo there; for behold the kingdom of God is within you." Luke xvii. 20, 21. History takes cognizance only of events concerning which men say, "lo here or lo there;" which come with out-

Digitized by Google

ward show; of course, though the coming of the Son of Man was like the lightning which illuminates the whole heavens, instantaneous and sublime, the disciples were taught that worldly historians would know nothing of the event; that all, save those whose eyes were open to the inner kingdom, would look in vain for the fulfilment of his prediction; that "scoffers, men walking after their own lusts, and saying where is the promise of his coming?—*for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation*"—would be deluded, and that day should come upon them unawares, as a thief in the night, and a snare. The nature of the case, then, demands that we cease to seek for historical evidence of the coming of the Son of Man at the time predicted. We need no such evidence. The simple declaration of Christ, that within the generation of his cotemporaries he would come in his kingdom, with power and great glory, is a sufficient basis for our faith, though history not only fails to confirm, but contradicts the declaration. His word will stand though heaven and earth pass away. "Let God be true and every man a liar."

If any still press the inquiry, "How can these things be?" we present them with the following explanation of the views we have gathered on this subject from the whole tenor of the New Testament. The coming of the Son of Man was an event which pertained to the invisible world, or,

Digitized by Google

as it is frequently denominated in the New Testament, "the world to come." The language in which it was predicted was by the necessity of the case figurative or symbolical, being addressed to "the children of this world," to whom suitable conceptions of its glory and terror could be conveyed only by descriptions of external and visible scenery. All the dead were citizens of the invisible world, and witnesses of the coming of the Son of Man according to the declaration of Christ, "The time is coming when all that are in the graves shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." John v. 29. Believers on earth were also citizens of that world, and of course witnesses of the coming of the Son of Man. They are constantly represented in the New Testament as "fellow-citizens with the saints," having their "conversation (or citizenship) in heaven;"—"made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light;" "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son;" "having tasted the powers of the world to come;" "having come unto Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven." "If ye be dead with Christ," says Paul, "from the rudiments of the world

Digitized by Google

why as though living in the world are ye subject to ordinances?" &c. Dividing then, the human race into two great classes, *the children of this world*, viz. living unbelievers, and *the children of the invisible world*, viz. all the dead and living believers, we affirm that the latter class only were witnesses of the glorious advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem. The only earthly visible accompaniment of the coming of the Son of Man, was an awful overthrow of the Jewish Theocracy, in which millions of the rejecters of Christ and his gospel were slain, and thus ushered into the presence of their Judge. All things else, in the view of carnal scoffers, continued as they were from the beginning of the creation.

If these things be so, it is easy to discern the source and trace the progress of the delusion in respect to this subject, which has reigned 1800 years. As believers only among the living were witnesses of the glorious advent of Christ, from them only the world could receive information concerning the period of its occurrence. Two circumstances are noticeable in respect to the case of these, which may help us to account for the fact that they have left no record behind. 1. The number of true believers was very small. This is implied in the question of Christ. "When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke xviii. 8. Great apostasies and

Digitized by Google

delusions, as we have seen, preceded the event; the love of many had waxed cold, and there is great reason to believe that the number of the elect who were kept from that last hour of dreadful "temptation, which came upon all the world to try them that dwelt upon the earth," (Rev. iii. 10,) was very small. 2. This small number at the coming of Christ, according to Scripture, were removed from the world. "The Lord himself shall descend with a shout, &c. and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we be ever with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. Thus the true light, by which the world might have known the truth on this subject, was extinguished. Nominal believers, doubtless, of whom multitudes remained, whose citizenship was not in heaven, who knew nothing of the kingdom which "cometh not with observation," received the predictions of Christ concerning his second coming in their literal import, and looked for a day of judgment, such as is now anticipated. They outlived the time of the promise of Christ's coming, and yet all things continued as they were. Of course the time of the promise was carried forward, new modes of interpreting the predictions, adapted to the exigency of the case, were devised; the expectations of nominal believers in a little while fell away from the definite

Digitized by Google

promises of the word of God into the uncertainties of tradition, and thus the world has floated on unwittingly almost two thousand years beyond the commencement of the great day of God, and at this hour all Christendom is dreaming that the Millenium is yet between our day and the second coming of the Son of Man.

Let it here be observed, that we by no means infer from the foregoing views, that the day of judgment, with all its concomitants, is past. We believe only that it commenced at the time predicted—that at the second coming of the Son of Man those who were previously dead were called from their graves, and the court of heaven commenced its session. Since then, "the children of this world," as they have successively entered within the veil, have been clothed with immortality, and have stood before their Judge. The delusion of carnal Christendom is not in anticipating a day of dreadful reckoning, but in denying that the great day of the world's judgment *commenced* at the dissolution of the Jewish Theocracy.

This delusion is not without a parallel. The concurrent and acknowledged testimony of prophecy, pointed the Jewish nation, to the period of the birth of Jesus, as the time of the coming of their Messiah. He came, but not in the *manner* they anticipated; they refused to recognize his claims of Messiahship, and were given

Digitized by Google

over to strong delusions, insomuch that at this day they anticipate as future the coming of that king, whom they crucified 1800 years ago. In like manner, Jewish Christendom, notwithstanding the decisive testimony of Scripture, pointing to the end of the Theocracy as the period of the advent of its king, failed to recognize his birth and presence because their *manner* was unexpected, and are now expecting only at a distant day the coming of him who came 1800 years ago. The first coming of Christ is to the Jewish nation what the second coming of Christ is to Christendom. As Christendom wonders at the delusion of the Jews, and longs for the time when they shall acknowledge Jesus their king, so we believe all heaven wonders at the delusion of Christendom, and longs for the time when he who appeared 1800 years ago "to them that looked for him without sin unto salvation," shall universally be acknowledged king. We may hope that Jews will confess that Jesus Christ has come into the world, when nominal Christians confess that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."

The bearings of the subject under discussion are multiplied, and as we view them, full of tremendous interest. We desire not to unfold them prematurely. Our design in the present article is, as before stated, simply to call the minds of those who love the word of God, to an independent and intelligent investigation of a single point,

Digitized by Google

viz. the *time* of the second coming of Christ; yet we may be permitted in conclusion to glance at some of the practical results of the truth we have received. We consider the second coming of Christ, for which primitive believers were waiting with almost breathless anxiety of hope, as the event which marks the transition from Judaism to Christianity. The difference between the two dispensations, we believe, in respect to the magnitude, not the nature of it, was rightly anticipated by the Jews before the coming of Christ, as appears in the following extract: "The Jews were accustomed to dispute concerning the *two ages* of the world, the one of which they called the "present age of world," the other "the age or world to come." The former, in their opinion, was to comprehend the time from the creation to the advent of the Messiah, and was marked by imbecility, imperfection, ignorance, vice, and calamity. The latter they referred to the joyful time when the Messiah should come in majesty to establish his dominion: when he should subdue to himself all kingdoms, recall the dead to life, sit in judgment, &c.; when, in short, he should introduce a new era, distinguished by liberty, knowledge, piety and felicity."—(Robinson's Lexicon, article AION.) Christianity—the kingdom of "the world to come"—was in embryo from the resurrection of Christ till his second coming. The apostolic age was the period

Digitized by Google

of the latter day glory of Judaism—the rising light of Christianity. As we date the life of man from the day of his birth, not from the day of his conception, so we date the beginning of Christianity from the second coming of the Son of Man, not from the birth or resurrection of Jesus. From these premises we draw the following conclusions:

1. As Christ nailed the ordinances of Judaism to his cross, so we believe he abolished, at his second coming, their substitutes—the ordinances of Christianity, or as they may more properly be called, the ordinances of the *transition period*; the time intervening between the resurrection and the second coming of Christ—the conception and the birth of Christianity. The words which prescribe the ordinance of the Lord's supper, thus limit its continuance—"As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he come*." 1 Cor. xi. 26.

2. The whole Bible—the New Testament as well as the old—was given under the Jewish dispensation, of course is applicable to those who are truly in the Christian dispensation, only as the Old Testament was applicable to the primitive Christians, or as the instructions pertinent to "this world" are applicable to the citizens of "the world to come." In other words, the whole Bible is the Old Testament to those who are in the kingdom of Christ. The New Testament is

Digitized by Google

written "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God." "This is the covenant I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts and write them in their minds; and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbour, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest." Heb. viii. 10, 11.

3. Objections to the doctrine of holiness of heart, drawn from examples in Scripture, are not in point, inasmuch as all such examples occurred before that revelation of Jesus Christ which commenced the dispensation in which we live, which perfected the faith and salvation of previous believers.

Admitting in supposition (though we by no means admit it in fact,) that the Bible presents no example of perfect holiness, it still contains the prediction and promise of a Savior then nigh at hand, who should "appear unto them that looked for him *without sin* unto salvation." Though "the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing," yet now "having boldness by the blood of Jesus to enter the holiest by a *new* and *living* way," we may "draw near with a true heart,' &c.

4. None are properly christians—i. e. full believers—who have not in their faith passed the period of the second coming of Christ; the peri-

Digitized by Google

od which in an important sense, closes probation, perfects and secures faith, and introduces its subjects to the liberty and privileges of "the world to come." In respect to privileges, promises, and the developement of the truth and grace of God, the race of man passed the dividing line between "time" and "eternity," as those terms are commonly used, 1800 years ago. All who are not in the kingdom which left sin behind it at the second coming of Christ, are not "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," have not come into fellowship with "the general assembly and church of the first-born," but are at least 1800 years in the rear of the salvation which God hath wrought for man. *Finally*, is it not high time to awake out of sleep? Such was the exhortation of Paul, in the dawn of the day of God. "*Knowing the time*," says he, "that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed; the night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the unfruitful works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light." Rom. xiii. 11, 12. The sun of righteousness was yet below the horizon in his day; sunrise was at hand before the canon of Scripture closed. The beloved disciple declares, "the darkness is past, the true light now shineth." 1 John ii. 8. "*Knowing the time*," our prayer is that this morning-call may resound through the

Digitized by Google

world: "It is high time to awake out of sleep, for our salvation has come; the darkness is past; the full-orbed sun is in the heavens."

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY.

For the convenience of those who may wish to investigate the subject of the preceding article, we have collected and arranged under several heads, references to most of the passages relating to it in the New Testament. A careful examination of them, we believe, will satisfy every candid mind. 1. That the expressions, "the coming of the kingdom of God," of "the kingdom of heaven," "the coming of the Lord," of "Christ," "the coming of the great day," of "the day of God," of "*that* day," &c. all refer to *one* event. 2. That the invisible spiritual world was the sphere of the manifestation of that event. 3. That it occurred within the life-time of some who were cotemporaries with Christ in his first appearance. 4. That the *precise* time of its occurrence was not revealed in the predictions concerning it. 5. That it was preceded by a wide-spread announcement of its approach. 6. That it was preceded, and its near approach betokened, by the appearance of many Antichrists, false-prophets, apostasies and delusions. 7. That it introdu-

Digitized by Google

ced a new dispensation, far surpassing in grace and glory, that which preceded it.

I. *The nature of the kingdom introduced by the second coming of Christ.*

Luke xvii, 20—24. Compare Matthew xxiv 23—27. 2 Peter iii, 10, &c.

Luke xx, 34—36: Comp. Matt. xxii, 30: Mark xii, 25: 1Cor. vii, 29: Matt. xix, 12: Also Luke xxiv, 31: Matt. xxvii, 52, 53: Phil. iii, 11.

John iii, 3: Comp. 1 Cor. xv, 50:

John xiv, 19: xviii, 36: Acts vii, 55—56: Comp. Acts ix, 3—5 2 Kings vi, 17:

1 Cor. ii, 9—14; Comp. 1 Cor. xv, 44: &c. 1 Cor. xv 50—53.

II. *The limitation of the time of the second coming of Christ.*

Mark i, 15. Comp. Daniel ix, 24—27. Matt. iii, 2. iv. 17. x, 7. &c.

Matt. x, 23. Comp. Dan. vii, 13—27.

Matt. xvi, 27, 28. Comp. Mal. iii, 1—3, 17, 18. iv, 1—6. 2 Tim. iv, 1, 2.

Matt. xxiv. 34, 35. Comp. Matt. xxiv, 1—31. Mark xiii, 30. Luke xxi, 32.

Luke ix, 27. xvi, 16. xxiii, 28—30. Note. The bearing of this last quotation will be seen by examining the refererences following. Comp. Rev. vi. 12—17. with Rev. i. 1—3, and iv, 2.

Digitized by Google

John xxi. 22. Comp. Rev. i. 10—18.

Acts xvii. 30—31. Comp. Matt. iii. 2, &c.

Rom. xiii, 11—13. Comp. Luke i. 77—79. xxi, 34. 1 Thes. v. 4—8. 2 Pet. i. 19. 1 John ii. 8, &c.

Rom. xvi. 20. Comp. Gen. iii, 15. 1 Pet. i. 13. Rev. xii. 7—11.

1 Cor. x. 11. Comp. Matt. xxiv, 3, Heb. ix, 26.

Phil. iv, 5, Heb. x, 24, 25. Comp. Acts xvii 30, 31.

Heb. x, 36, 37. Comp. James v, 7—9. Luke xxi, 19.

James v, 7—9. Comp. Heb. xii, 22, 23.

1 Peter iv. 4, 5, 7, 17.. Rev. i, 1 : Comp. Rev. i, 3, 7 : ii, 5, 16. 2 Thes. ii, 8.

Note. In Rev. i. 1 and 3. we are expressly informed that the apocalypse is a prophetic record of events, *then nigh at hand*. Bearing in mind this intimation, the character of the whole book, as a description of the events, preceding, accompanying and following the second coming of Christ, will easily be discovered. The *first* and most frequently repeated prediction of the book is thus recorded in the 7th verse of the first chapter. "Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." See Rev. ii, 5, 16, 25 : iii, 3—11 : xxii, 7, 12, 20.

Digitized by Google

III. *The uncertainty of the time.*

Mark. xiii, 32—37. Comp. Matt. xxiv 36—51. xxv, 1—13. Luke xii, 35—40. xxi, 34—36.

Acts i, 6, 7. 1 Thess. v, 1—3. Comp. Mat. xxiv, 37—39.

2 Pet. iii, 10. Rev. iii, 3.

IV. *The previous announcement of the kingdom.*

Matt. xxiv, 14. Comp. Mark xiii, 10.

Matt. xxviii 19, 20. Comp. Mark xvi, 15.

Mark xvi, 19, 20. Acts i, 8. Rom, xv, 19. Col. i, 5, 6, 23. Comp. Mark xvi, 15.

V. *Antichrists, false prophets, apostasies, delusions,* &c.

Matt. xxiv. 4—12, 24. Comp. Mark, xiii. 5, 6, 21, 22. Luke, xxi. 8, &c.

Luke xviii. 8. Acts, xx. 28—30. 2 Thess. ii. 3—10. 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2. 2 Tim. iii. 1—5. 2 Tim. iv. 3—4. Titus, i. 10, 11, 16:

2 Pet. ii. 1, 2, 3. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 8.

2 Pet. iii. 3, 4. 1 John, ii. 18, 26. iv. 1, 2, 3. 2 John, 7, 8. Jude, 4, 17—19. Rev. ii. 2, 3, 4, 20. iii. 1, 15.

VI. *Intimations concerning the accompaniments, privileges, and glory of the new dispensation, anticipated by primitive believers, and introduced*

Digitized by Google

by the second coming of Christ.

Matt. xi. 11. Comp. Luke vii. 28.

Matt. xix. 28. Comp. Luke xxii. 29, 30. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, Rev. ii. 26, 27. iii. 21, &c.

Matt. xxv. 31, 32. Comp. Matt. iii. 10, 11, 12. Malachi, iii. 18: iv. 1—6. 1 Cor. iii. 13—15, &c. Matt. xxiv. 13. Comp. Rom. xiii. 11. Heb. ix. 28. 1 Pet. i. 13. Rev. ii. 10—25. iii. 11, &c.

Luke, xxi. 28. Acts, iii 19—21. Rom. xvi 20. 1 Cor i, 7, 8. iv. 4, 5. xv. 22, 23. Comp. John v, 25, 28, 29, &c.

Phil. i 6—10: Comp. 1 Thess. iii 13: Phil. iii, 20, 21: Comp. 1 Cor. xxv, 51, &c.

Col. iii, 4, Comp. 1 Thess. ii, 19, 20.

1 Thess. i, 9, 10: iv, 13—18, v, 23. 2 Thess. i, 6—10, 1 Tim. vi, 13—15, 2 Tim i, 12: iv, 1, 2, 8: Titus ii, 11—13: Heb. ix, 28: 1 Peter, i, 3—7, 13: v, 4: 2 Peter iii, 11—14: 1 John, ii, 28: iii, 2: Jude, 24, 25.

Digitized by Google

OBJECTIONS

TO THE SECOND COMING.

Several objections from Scripture, to the views of the second coming of Christ, presented in the preceding article, have frequently been suggested. As the most prominent examples we give the following passages, with such explanations as have satisfied our own minds, and may relieve many.

I. Acts, i. 11. "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." We first inquire, in what *manner* he went into heaven. He did not go into heaven in a body which was visible to natural men in the flesh. Such language as the following abundantly proves that he was "as the angels," (see Matt. xxii. 30,) after his resurrection. "Now when Jesus was arisen early the first day of the week, he *appeared* first to Mary Magdalene." "After that he *appeared in another form* unto two of them." "Afterward he *appeared* unto the eleven," &c. Mark xvi. 9, 12, 14.

"While they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them; but *their eyes were holden that they should not know him.*" "He took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to them, and *their eyes were opened,*

Digitized by Google

and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." Luke xxiv. 15, 16, 30, &c. Twice he appeared in the midst of his disciples, as they were assembled in a room, "*the doors being shut.*" John xx. 19, 26. Language like this is every. where used in describing the visits of the inhabitants of the angelic world, see Matt. xxvii. 53. Luke xxii. 34. 2 Kings vi. 17, &c.

Again, he did not go into heaven in the presence of the assembled multitudes of this world. A few only of his disciples, and they only by supernatural illumination, saw him after his resurrection, and witnessed his ascension. If then Christ *so came in like manner as he went into heaven*, he came in a *spiritual, angelic* body, invisible to any, save those whose "eyes were opened:" and appeared on earth, not to the congregated nations, but to a few chosen witnesses who were looking for his coming.

II. 2 Pet. iii. 12. In this passage, the second coming of Christ is represented as about to usher in the day of judgment, in which "the earth and its works should be burned up," "the heavens being on fire should be dissolved, and the elements should melt with fervent heat," &c. It is evident on the face of the passage, that the *literal* sense of the language can never be fulfilled. The heavens can never *literally* pass away with a great noise, or being on fire, be dissolved. There is a plain allusion in such expressions, to

Digitized by Google

the popular Jewish notions concerning the visible heavens, viz. that the blue concave is a cloth-like substance, stretched out over the earth, in the fashion of a tent; which can be "rolled together as a scroll," Rev. vi. 14. and therefore can pass away, and be consumed with fire. The language is evidently not philosophical, but popular or poetical, and not more highly colored than the description which Christ gives of his coming in Matt. xxiv. 29–31, concerning which he immediately after says, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things shall be fulfilled." By examining the following references, similar language will be found, poetically describing great events, which confessedly were not accomplished by any such visible phenomena as were predicted in the language literally understood. Isaiah xxxiv. 4. Ezekiel xxxii. 7, 8. Amos viii. 9. The second coming of Christ, marked the period of the transition of the righteous from "this world" to that "heaven and earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness;" as also the period of the fiery destruction of the wicked who were in a condition to witness his appearing. The change which transfers vision from the natural to the spiritual world, may appropriately be described by the expressions, "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise," "the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved," &c. and as "our God is a consuming

Digitized by Google

fire," whenever the veil of the flesh is removed, i. e. whenever "the heavens pass away," every man finds himself "dwelling in devouring fire—inhabiting everlasting burnings," the earth and its works, nay, the universe, if God is omnipresent, is found to be enveloped in the burning glories of his essence. The righteous find that the same energy which is a consuming fire to the wicked, is to the saints a fathomless, shoreless ocean of glory. Such developements may well be described by the expressions, "the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up"—"the elements shall melt with fervent heat," &c. Such a change Peter evidently intended to describe, not in precise, philosophical language, but in such a way as best to convey to the minds of men living in this world, and little conversant with spiritual phenomena, the glory and terror of the coming day of God. We may even grant that Peter, and those to whom he wrote expected the literal fulfilment of his predictions, and yet believe and maintain, that the Holy Ghost, speaking through him, designed only to set forth spiritual events, by descriptions of visible scenery. Certain it is that this passage describes the self-same transactions which in many other passages of the New Testament, are predicted as about to come within the generation cotemporary with Christ. Compare 2 Peter iii. 3—7 with Matt. xxiv. 37,

Digitized by Google

2 Peter iii. 10, with Matt. xxiv. 43: and 1 Thes. v. 2. 2 Peter iii. 12, 13. with Luke xxi. 28, and Titus ii. 13, &c.

III. Rev. i. 7. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." This language is almost identical with that in Matt. xxiv. 30: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then shall *all the tribes of the earth mourn;* and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the *clouds of heaven* with power and great glory." The original Greek shows more clearly than the English version, that John quoted the language of Christ, with reference to the same events. Now Christ says of the things which he thus described, "verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled;" and indeed John says almost the same thing in the first and third verses of the chapter from which the questionable passage is quoted. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must *shortly come to pass.*" "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy and keep those things which are written therein, for *the time is at hand.*" Plainly then, if the consistency of John or of Christ is maintained, the meaning of the language of both must be so modified, as to bring the event they describe

Digitized by Google

within the time they designate. This can only be done by adopting the principles of interpretation, suggested in the former part of this article, by referring such language to the transactions of the spiritual world.

We would say once for all, we fully believe a *third* appearance of Christ is approaching, in which the predictions in Isaiah xxv. 6, 9; Daniel ii. 31—45; Rom. viii. 21, and many other passages, especially of the Old Testament, will be fulfilled. Yet we deem it exceedingly important, that the prophecies of Scripture should not be confounded one with another; that it should be clearly seen, that *the* coming of Christ constantly, and almost exclusively referred to in the New Testament, is not future, but past. Whether that coming is *typical* of one that is yet future, is altogether another subject of inquiry. We believe it is. Viewing the whole Jewish Theocracy as a typical or representative institution, considering its king, the man Christ Jesus, as a representative of Christ the king of the world, which is the church, of which Christ Jesus is the Head: we also believe that his second coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, is representative of a second coming in his church, which will be accompanied by an overthrow of the Jerusalem which now is, viz. Christendom. Yet let us beware how we confound the shadow with the substance. The passage of the Israelites from

Digitized by Google

Egypt to Canaan, is declared to be a type of the transition from Judaism to Christianity, 1 Cor. x. 1, 11. The entrance of the promised land evidently corresponded with the second coming of Christ. Now the Christians of the primitive church would scarcely have made a more glaring and puerile mistake, in doubting or denying that their fathers had entered the promised land, than is now made by all, who doubt or deny that Christ appeared "to them that looked for him the second time without sin unto salvation," at the time predicted, i. e. within the generation co-temporary with himself.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW COVENANT.

Every reader of the Bible must have observed, that two covenants are frequently mentioned and recognized therein, differing from each other in many important respects, and pertaining respectively to the Jewish and Christian dispensations. The division of the Bible into two books, called the "old and new *testaments*," or "*covenants*," (for both of these words are uniformly translations of "*diatheke*" in the original,) is a fact, fitted perpetually to suggest the existence and difference of the two covenants. (For instances of direct allusion to them, see Mat. xxvi. 28; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Gal. iv. 24; Heb. vii. 22; viii. 6—13; ix. 15; etc.) As we live in the "last time," (1 John, ii. 18;) the period subsequent to the coming of the mediator of the "new covenant," (Gal. iv. 4;) it well behoves us to understand the nature, terms and privileges of that covenant, lest we be found at the last in the case of those who "knew not the time of their visitation," and perished, though the "kingdom of God came nigh unto them." This we may do by giving heed to the special discussion of the subject, contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. That book might well be entitled, "A Comparison of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations," or in other words,

Digitized by Google

"the Old and New Covenants." In this article we invite attention, especially to a statement of the principles of the New Covenant, contained in the eighth chapter of that epistle, viz. (beginning at ver. 6.) "Now hath he (Christ) obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon *better promises*; for if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second. For, finding fault with them, he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *New Covenant* with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; *because they continued not in my covenant*, (although I was an husband unto them. See Jeremiah xxxi. 32; from which the apostle quotes,) and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For *this* is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, *after those days*, saith the Lord, *I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts:* and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and *they shall not teach every man his neighbour*, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for *all shall know me*, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no

Digitized by Google

more. In that he saith, a *New* Covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, *is ready to vanish away.*"

In elucidating this passage we shall notice, 1. the *time*, 2. the *nature*, 3. the *mode of fulfillment* of the New Covenant.

I. THE TIME OF THE DISPENSATION OF THE NEW COVENANT. We observe,

1. *The New Covenant was not made before the time of Moses*, for then the "new" was made before the "old," the "second" before the "first." "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *New* Covenant, etc., *not according to the covenant* which I made with their fathers, *when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt*," i. e. the time of Moses. "If that *first* covenant," i. e. the one ministered by Moses, (see v. 5;) had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the *second.*"

2. *It was not made before the time of Jeremiah*, from whose prophecy this passage is quoted; for then he represented that as *future*, which was *past*. "Behold *the days come*, saith the Lord, when I *will* make a New Covenant," etc. "This is the covenant that I *will* make with the house of Israel *after those days*," etc.

NOTE. These two remarks are made for the purpose of subverting the notion of some who deny, that Christianity is established upon better promises than preceding dispensations; saying

Digitized by Google

that the covenant now under consideration, was made with Abraham. This notion is chiefly founded on a passage in Galatians, iii. 8, etc. "The scripture foreseeing, that God would justify the heathen, through faith, preached before, (or foretold) the gospel unto Abraham, saying, (not "I will put my law into *thy* heart," but,) in thee *shall all nations be blessed.*" Observe, this was only a prediction or promise of the *future* preaching of the gospel, not a preaching of the gospel itself to Abraham. If this proves, that the New Covenant was made with Abraham, we may prove, by the same rule, that it was made with the house of Israel, at the time Jeremiah said, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel;" for in these words he preached the same gospel which was preached to Abraham, viz. a prediction of the New Covenant. By the same rule also, we may prove, that every prediction in the bible, of *future* blessings, gave, to those who received them, *present possession* of those blessings. But the passage following, from the same chapter, v. 15; &c. is perhaps considered more conclusive. "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet, if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and to his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many, but as of one; and

to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before, of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Do these words declare, as some suppose that the law was given four hundred and thirty years after the gospel? No, verily, for then, as we have seen, the new covenant was four hundred and thirty years older than the old. We concede that the covenant "was confirmed of God *in Christ*," before the giving of the law, and before the world began; but it was not confirmed of God *in Abraham*. He received only the *promise* of the future fulfillment of the covenant, when his seed which was Christ, should come. Our present discussion respects not the question, when God *purposed* the establishment of the New Covenant, or when he made the covenant *with his Son*, or when he first *predicted to man* its fulfillment; or whether he promised to *Abraham*, that it should be fulfilled in his seed,—but when it *first took effect upon the human race*. This is what we mean when we inquire, when the New Covenant was made; and this is what Jeremiah meant when he said, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel." In calling it a *New* Covenant, and representing it as *future*, he did not intend to intimate, that it was *new* or *future*, in the mind of God or of Christ; neither

Digitized by Google

did he intend to deny, that it was promised to Abraham and his seed; but he did intend to intimate, that the human race had not yet received its blessings. That Paul had no other view of the matter than that which we have given, is evident from what he says, in several verses following the passage in question; for example, v. 19. "Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, *till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made,*" v. 23; "*Before faith came* we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should *afterwards* be revealed."

Besides all this, Paul expressly declares, in two instances, that Abraham had not "received the *promise*," evidently meaning thereby the New Covenant. Hebrews, xi. 13 and 39.

The covenant which God made with Abraham, "*and his seed*," which of course was in existence and force, when Jeremiah predicted the New Covenant, was not identical with the New Covenant—for if it was, Jeremiah falsely represented that as future, which was past. The covenant made with Abraham stood in the same relation to the New Covenant, as that in which Abraham stood to Christ. As Christ, "the seed to whom the promise was made"—was in the loins of Abraham—so the New Covenant, was, if we may use the expression—*seminally* included in the covenant made with Abraham. Yet as Christ was

Digitized by Google

not born till two thousand years after Abraham, so the New Covenant was not developed and fulfilled till two thousand years after Abraham's covenant; so that, if Jeremiah could properly represent the coming of Christ as future, he could with equal propriety represent the New Covenant as future.

3. *The New Covenant was made at the coming of Christ*, i. e. it began to take effect upon the human race, when "God was manifest in the flesh." This is implied in the first words of the passage under consideration. "Now hath he (Christ) obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better Covenant.*" It is also implied in the comparison, which occupies almost the whole epistle to the Hebrews, between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as will be seen in the following examples. "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, &c. how shall we escape, if we neglect so *great salvation* which *at the first began to be spoken by the Lord.*" Heb. ii. 2, 3. "Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." v. 9. "Christ being come, &c., by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." ix. 11, 12

"Now once *in the end of the world*, hath he appeared to put away sin." ix. 26.

The tenth chapter expressly designates the

Digitized by Google

coming of Christ, as the commencement of the dispensation of the New Covenant. "*When he cometh into the world*, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me, &c. Above when he said, sacrifice and offering, &c. thou wouldst not, which are offered by the *law*, *then* said he, lo *I come* to do thy will O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, &c. *Whereof* the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said, *this is the covenant* that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, *I will put my laws into their hearts.*" &c Heb. x. 5—17. Here Paul uses the words which predict the establishment of the New Covenant, as descriptive of the work which commenced when Christ came into the world, and substituted the sacrifice of himself, for the sacrifices of the law.

While we assert that the New Covenant *began* to take effect at the first coming of Christ, we believe its principles and powers were not *fully* developed till his second coming, at the final abrogation of the Mosaic institution. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." The second was established fully only when the first was wholly taken away. The *transition period* of forty years, between the first and second coming of Christ, was a period, during which the principles of the Old and New Covenants were

Digitized by Google

blended together. As Judaism was gradually waxing old, decaying and vanishing away, Christianity gradually attained the vigor and maturity of its developement. Indeed, in one sense, Christ himself came gradually. He who is "the way, the *truth*, and the life," had not fully come, till the canon of Scripture was closed. So that the expression "the coming of Christ," may properly be regarded as covering the whole time between his first and second coming; and in this sense we may say, without qualification, the New Covenant was made at the coming of Christ.

II. THE NATURE OF THE NEW COVENANT.

1. *It secures salvation from sin.* Its chief promise is, "*I will put my law into their mind and write them in their hearts.*" Thus the whole law becomes a promise. Under the old covenant, God said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," *or suffer damnation.* Under the New Covenant, he says, "Thou shalt love the the Lord thy God with all thy heart," *for I have promised it and will secure it.* Grace takes the place of legal penalty: statutes become promises.

That the New Covenant is a promise of perfect sanctification, plainly appears from the connection in which it is spoken of in the tenth chapter. "Then said he, lo I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second: by the which will, we *are sanctified*, &c. For by one offering he hath for-

Digitized by Google

ever *perfected* them that are sanctified. *Whereof* the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us, for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, *I will put my laws into their hearts, &c.* Some suppose, that the sanctification and perfection mentioned in this passage, refer only to *justification* by the sacrifice of Christ. Whereas Paul's application of the words of the Holy Ghost "I will put my laws into their hearts," proves undeniably, that he referred to subjective righteousness, personal sanctification.

The contrast between the law, as a dispensation which could not purge the conscience, or make the subjects of it perfect: and the gospel, as bringing in everlasting righteousness, is insisted upon throughout the epistle to the Hebrews: e. g. vii. 18, 19; ix. 8—14; x. 1—22; xi. 89. 40; &c: as also in many other of his epistles: e. g. Rom. vi. 14; viii. 3, 4; x. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 6—9; where the New Covenant is called "the ministration of righteousness," Gal. iv. 3—5, &c. The office of Christ, as the mediator of the New Covenant, was stated at his birth. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall *save his people from their sins.*" Matt. i. 21. We declare with Paul, "this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to *save sinners.*"

Digitized by Google

2. *It secures salvation from sin forever.* This remark, perhaps, can scarcely be distinguished from the former; for salvation from sin, in the proper signification of the expression, is salvation from sin forever. Whatever interrupts everlasting holiness, surely is sin, and he that ever falls into sin, can scarcely be said to have been *saved from* sin; certainly he was not saved from the worst of all sins, viz. apostasy. Yet the distinction we have made is common. Many believe themselves wholly sanctified, who yet have no assurance of remaining so. We observe therefore, on this point, that the contrast instituted between the New Covenant and the Old, decisively shows, that the former secures salvation *forever.* "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel, &c. *not according* to the covenant that I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; *for they continued not in my covenant,* (though I was an husband unto them,) and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." It is plain, that the deficiency of the old covenant was the fact, that one party continued not in it, which deficiency, by the terms of the contrast, was not to exist in the new one. "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them on their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and

Digitized by Google

they shall be to me a people." Under the first covenant, he declared only, "I will be to them a God," *if* they will be to me a people. They sinned against him, and the covenant became unprofitable. Under the second covenant he engages for the faithfulness of both parties. "I will be to them a God, and *they shall be to me a people*," for "I will write my laws on their hearts." In the first case, God was a faithful husband, but the house of Israel was an unfaithful bride. In the second case, God not only promises to be a faithful husband, but engages to secure the fidelity of his bride. In other words, the New Covenant is one in which God secures the fulfillment of its requisitions on both sides. This idea is evidently alluded to in that puzzling passage in Galatians, iii. 20; "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Having characterized the Jewish dispensation as one given by the ministration of angels, "*in the hands of a mediator*," he takes occasion to show its inferiority, by contrast with the Christian dispensation, in this respect. The fact that there was a mediator under the law, showed the separation that existed between God and man. "A mediator is not a mediator of *one*." Whereas through Christ, under the gospel, God and man are identified. The two parties of the former covenant, flow together and become one, *in the mediator*, so that he is no longer properly a mediator. God,

Digitized by Google

and Christ, and man, are not three, but one; for the divine nature dwells in all, and "God is one." In fact, there is but one party to the New Covenant, so that it might properly be called an unconditional promise. For confirmation of the point under consideration, we refer again to the mention of the New Covenant, in the tenth chapter. "By one offering, he hath perfected, *forever*, them that are sanctified, *whereof* the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us," &c. in the words of the New Covenant.

But it is objected, that a covenant, such as we exhibit, is inconsistent with the free agency of man. Most of those who make this objection, believe the common doctrine of the "perseverance of the saints," and pray for sanctification by the power of God. Such are forever barred from a hearing of their objection; for it is inconsistent with their own principles. All believe, that the holiness of saints in heaven is eternally secure; all, therefore, admit the consistency of the *principle* of the New Covenant, with the free agency of man.

3. *The New Covenant gives liberty from external law.* This also is implied in the contrast presented between the old and the new dispensation. The New Covenant is "*not according* to the covenant" made with the house of Israel by the mediation of Moses. Under the latter, the law was written on tables of stone. Under the

Digitized by Google

former, it is written on the heart. "I will put my law in their minds, and write them on their hearts." And by this difference of administration, we may account for the difference of the promised success of the two systems. External law of necessity supposes internal depravity. "The law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." 1 Tim. i. 9. Who ever heard of a law, that men shall eat or sleep? Such a law would be ridiculous, simply because all men are *sufficiently disposed* to eat and sleep. So if men were *sufficiently disposed* to love God with the whole heart, a law requiring them to do so, would be equally ridiculous. This disposition God promises, by the New Covenant, to secure; and his promise abolishes his statute. But under the Jewish dispensation, by reason of the deficiency of this disposition, the statute was necessary, in order to secure, at least, external obedience. "It was added, because of transgressions." "It was a schoolmaster unto Christ." (See the original.) Gal. iii. 19, 24 While the law secured to some extent external obedience, it still by no means *disposed* the heart to the love of God. It could not give righteousness; on the contrary, it aggravated the guilt of its subjects. "The law entered that the offence might abound." Rom. v. 20. "The law worketh wrath." Rom. iv. 15. So that the *nature* of the old covenant shows us why "they

Digitized by Google

continued not" in it; as also the *nature* of the New Covenant shows us why it produces a better result. The first operates on the understanding; the second, on the disposition or nature of man. The first attempts to check the leprosy of sin, by external medication; the second purges the blood, and by purging the blood, *removes the necessity or propriety of external medication.* Under the old covenant, God said, "Do according to all I command you, and ye shall live." Under the New Covenant, he says, "Do as you please, for I promise that your pleasure shall be mine. I will write my law upon your hearts." Thus *perfect liberty* is one essential element of the New Covenant. For further discussion of this point, see Rom. vi. 14. vii. 1—25; and the whole epistle to the Galatians, 1 Tim. i. 5—17, &c.

4. *The New Covenant sets its subjects above the necessity of man's teaching.* "They shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." The difference between the Old and New Covenants, in this respect, is essentially the same as in the point last discussed. Outward is exchanged for inward operation. Under the Jewish dispensation, in respect to instruction, Moses was the principal mediator between God and man. He, with a few others in succeeding ages,

Digitized by Google

were permitted to draw nigh to God, and receive by personal communication with him, instruction and commandments. But the mass of the people could not be said to "*know* the Lord." They heard from him by their teachers, but they were not personally acquainted with him. Moses, groaning under the burden of his office, longed for a system of universal personal instruction from the Lord. "Would God," says he, "that *all* the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them!" Numbers xi. 29. The New Covenant gives the blessing he desired. There is now but "one mediator between God and man, even Jesus Christ;" and he not a mediator in such a sense as implies separation between the parties, but one *in whom the parties meet and are one.* So that *all* the Lord's people are prophets—all *know* the Lord. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. Ye need not that any man teach you." 1 John, ii. 20, 27. "There hath not been born of women a greater than John the Baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God,"—the dispensation of the New Covenant, "is greater than he." Matt. xi. 11. Every subject of the New Covenant walks in a sure pathway of truth, and shall stand, though he be the least in the kingdom of God, where John the Baptist would have fallen; he shall stand, though every inhabitant of the earth and hell call him a

Digitized by Google

fool and a madman, and work and watch for his downfall. God must be overcome, before he can be hurtfully ensnared. Compare with the doctrine here delivered, John xiv. 16—27; xvi. 7—15. Rom. xv. 14. 1 Cor. ii. 15. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Col. ii. 3—10.

III. THE MODE OF THE FULFILLMENT OF THE NEW COVENANT.

We have already, to some extent, incidentally discussed this part of our subject; but for the purpose of presenting it more directly we observe,

1. *Christ is the mediator of the New Covenant.* By him we are saved from sin—by him we are *secured* in holiness—by him we are made *free from the law*—by him we have access to God; so that we need not that any man *teach* us.

2. More specifically, *the New Covenant is fulfilled in believers, by the blood of Christ.* This is evident, from the following passages,

"If the blood of bulls and goats &c. sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the *blood of Christ*, who, through the eternal spirit offerred himself without spot unto God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God; and *for this cause* he is the mediator of the New Covenant." Heb. ix. 14, 15. In the tenth chapter, having stated the principles and introduction of the New Covenant, the apostle proceeds thus: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter the holiest, *by the blood of*

Digitized by Google

Jesus, by a new and living way, &c. let us draw near" &c. x. 19—22. Again,—"Ye are come —to Jesus, the mediator of the New Covenant, and to the *blood of sprinkling* that speaketh better things than that of Abel." xii. 22—24. Again,—"Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the *blood of the everlasting Covenant*, make you perfect," &c. xiii. 20, 21.

That we may have a more complete view of the testimony of Scripture on this subject, we quote several other passages, less explicitly referring to the New Covenant, but of a similar character.

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink *his blood*, ye have no life in you; whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." John iv. 53, 54. "In Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the *blood of Christ*." Eph. ii. 13. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received from your fathers, but with the *precious blood of Christ*." 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. "The *blood of Jesus Christ* his Son cleanseth from all sin." 1 John i. 7. "Unto him that washed us from our sins in *his own blood*, &c. be glory," &c. Rev i. 5. "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by *thy blood*." Rev. v. 9. "They overcame him

Digitized by Google

by the *blood of the Lamb.*" Rev. xii. 11.

In these passages the blood of Jesus Christ is represented as having power to "purge the conscience," to give access to "the holiest," to "sanctify," to give "eternal life," to "bring nigh" unto God, to "redeem" from sin, to "cleanse from all sin," to "wash from sin," to "overcome" Satan. The most careless observer, may perceive, that all this cannot be true of the mere blood of a human body, however applied, much less of human blood merely shed on a cross, operating as an expiation of past trasgression. How such blood, thus applied, can cleanse men from all sin, and bring them nigh unto God, we venture to say, nobody can tell. The nature of the case demands that we seek some other signification of the word "blood" in these passages, and some other mode of its application. We recur, then, to the definition of "blood" which God has given with great particularity, in Gen. ix. 4. Lev. xvii. 11—14. Deut. xii. 23. "*Blood is the life.*" The blood of Jesus Christ then, is the *life* of Jesus Christ. But the life of Jesus Christ is not the blood of his human body. He had life of infinitely higher value than his life in the flesh, before he became incarnate. Manifestly, the supposition, that the blood of his human body was his *life*, would be a denial of his pre-existence and his super-human nature. "Every spirit that confesseth that *Jesus Christ is come*

Digitized by Google

in the flesh is of God." 1 John iii. 2. Such a confession neccessarily recognizes the existence of Jesus Christ *before* he came in the flesh; but if the blood of the flesh in which he came is regarded as in a predominant sense, "the blood, i. e. the life of Jesus Christ," his pre-existing super-human life is overlooked. In order to ascertain what is meant in Scripture by the "*blood of Jesus Christ*," we must bear in mind what the Scripture teaches concerning his *nature*. Varying a little the words of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 39, &c. we argue thus: 'All blood is not the same blood, but there is one kind of blood of men, another blood of beasts, another of fishes, another of birds: so of the different orders of beings *above*, as well as below man, for there are *celestial*, as well as terrestrial bodies.' If we wish then to ascertain what kind of blood belongs to any of these orders of beings, we inquire what is the *nature* of the being? If we wish to ascertain what is the blood of Jesus Christ, we inquire what is his nature,—is it terrestrial or celestial? If he is a man, then his blood is human; if he is super-human, then his blood is super-human; if he is the Son of God, his blood is the Spirit of the living God. However strange, this language and reasoning may appear, it is abundantly authorized by the language and reasoning of Jesus himself. In John vi. 51, he says, "I am the living bread that *came down from heaven*. If any man eat of this

Digitized by Google

bread he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give is my *flesh*," &c. It is manifest then, that his *flesh came down from heaven*, and was not that human body which was born of the virgin Mary. Although *thrice*, in immediate connection with this passage, he virtually declared that his flesh and blood came down from heaven, the Jews supposed that he referred to his *human* flesh and blood, when he said "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you," and were greatly offended. He therefore explained himself more fully, (ver. 61—63.) "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where *he was before?*" [As if he had said, you must bear in mind my pre-existence, if you would understand my language.] It is the spirit, [my superhuman nature] that quickeneth,—[And this is what I mean when I say, Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,] the flesh, [my human nature,] profiteth nothing." Here then, we have Christ's own definition of the expression, "*the blood of Christ.*" *It is the life of that super-human nature which he had before his incarnation;* and in connection with this definition, he declares what that life was—"*I live by the Father.*" The Spirit, then, of the Father, or in other words, the Holy Ghost was the life, and therefore *the blood of Jesus Christ.* (For cases of parallel and illustrative phraseology, we

Digitized by Google

refer to John vii. 37–39. where the Holy Ghost is called "living water," i. e. blood; and 1 Cor. xii 13. where believers are represented as "*drinking* into one Spirit.") It is manifest that they who regard the human blood, that followed the spear on Calvary, as "*the blood of Christ*," deny his super-human nature, and degrade the Spirit of the living God into an animal fluid. Who, more than they, "tread under foot the Son of God, and *count the blood of the Covenant–an unholy thing?*" Heb. x. 20.

Having then corrected our conceptions of the nature of "the blood of Jesus Christ," we proceed to inquire how it is applied. Christ says, "Except ye *eat* my flesh and *drink* my blood, ye have no life in you." Whatever we eat and drink becomes a part of our nature. God forbade Noah and the Jews to drink the blood of animals, "which is their life," doubtless because, in so doing, they would receive the nature of the animals, and degrade their own. The blood of the bulls and goats which were sacrificed by the law, was not drank, but sprinkled upon the people, that it might at least imperfectly shadow forth the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, i. e. the effusion of the Holy Ghost. But that which was forbidden, in relation to the inferior animals which were used as types, was required in relation to the super-human Son of God, the typified victim. The virtue of *his* sacrifice must be

Digitized by Google

received by *drinking his blood*, and thus partaking of his nature. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *dwelleth in me and I in him*. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, *so* he that eateth me shall live by me." It is plain that the act of faith, the operation of God, by which we receive Jesus Christ, is described by the expressions "eating flesh" and "drinking blood" in order to convey the idea that we thereby come into a living union with him, and partake of his nature. His blood becomes our blood, his life our life. Christ endeavoured to make this idea permanent and prominent by the institution of the sacramental supper, the initiatory symbol of the New Covenant. Paul thus describes the institution of that ordinance,—"The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, *eat*; this is my body, which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup when he had supped, saying, THIS IS THE NEW COVENANT IN MY BLOOD: this do ye as oft as ye *drink* it, in remembrance of me." As Christ had before explained to his disciples what he meant by "eating his flesh and drinking his blood," in John vi. 63, as we have seen above, he designed without controversy to make the sacramental supper a symbol of the transaction by which believers

Digitized by Google

became *one* with him. The wine of the eucharist is a type of the life-blood of the super-human Son of God, by which the New Covenant is fulfilled. Believers "have been baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink into that one Spirit." Thus they have eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of the Son of Man. Thus they receive the substance of which the sacramental supper was a shadow. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ?" 1 Cor. x. 16. "Do we not profess to drink the blood of the Son of God and thus have communion with him?"

It will be seen that these views are opposed to the notions of those who regard the expiatory offering of the human body of Christ as the substance shadowed forth by the sacrifices of the law and by the Lord's supper. Such persons, regarding themselves as justified, but not sanctified by the sacrifice of Christ, make the blood of the everlasting covenant the seal of their license to sin. By "*looking* to Calvary," their faith receives forgiveness, while they continue in sin. This is not "*eating* the flesh and *drinking* the blood of the Son of Man." It will be seen, also, that these views, and these only, furnish a satisfactory explanation of those passages touching the efficacy of the blood of Christ, with which the New Testament abounds; some of which were quoted at the commencement of this discussion of that sub-

Digitized by Google

ject. Moreover they greatly help us to understand the meaning of those passages which represent the church as the body of Christ: e. g. 1 Cor. vi. 15, xii. 12, and Eph. i. 23, iv. 4—16 v. 23–32, Col. ii. 2–19, &c. The body of Christ is filled with his own blood. By becoming a member of the true church, then, we receive the life-blood of Christ; and the "blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." Thus is fulfilled the promise of God concerning the latter days: "Judah shall dwell forever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation, *for I will cleanse their blood*, that I have not cleansed, for the Lord dwelleth in Zion." Joel iii. 20, 21.

Thus we conclude, as the sum of all that has been said, that the New Covenant commenced its operation upon the human race *at the coming of Christ*; that its fulfillment gives *perfect holiness, perfect security of holiness, perfect liberty, and perfect independence of human instruction*; that it is fulfilled in believers by the energy of *the blood of Christ*, the spirit of the living God.

We by no means say, that none but those, who have received *all* the blessings of this covenant, are *in any sense* Christians. The disciples were called *Christians* first in Antioch, (Acts xi. 26.) long before the gospel of the New Covenant was fully developed. (See the concluding remark under our first head, "the time &c.") Men are called *Christians*, in our day, because they "call upon

the name of the Lord Jesus," because they have experienced "conviction and conversion," and make an outward profession of religion, nay, even because they live within the bounds of Christendom. We grant also, if any have received any *one* of the blessings of the New Covenant, *so far* they are Christians, in the sense that looks at character and not profession. Many profess to have received that blood which "cleanseth from all sin," without the promise of security. If their hearts are pure, *so far* they are not under the old covenant; for that could not purge the conscience. Many others profess to be free from the law, and not free from sin. So far as their profession is intelligent and sincere, they are not under the old covenant, for that gave no liberty. In short we have reason to believe that there are, and have been many, in all ages since the second coming of Christ, who in one respect or another have had "the testimony of Jesus," the mediator of the New Covenant; yet we do say none are, or have been, *Christians*, in the sense in which Paul was, (if his state correspon. ded to his preaching) who have not received, PERFECT HOLINESS, PERFECT SECURITY, PERFECT LIBERTY, AND PERFECT INDEPENDENCE, BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

Digitized by Google

THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS.

GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH.

The following is a specimen of the language of Scripture, touching what we deem a central truth of the gospel of our salvation, "God manifest in the flesh" of saints. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by him, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." John vi 53–57. "At that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you." John xiv. 20. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on me through their word. That they also may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them and thou in, me that they may be made perfect in one, that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." John xvii. 20—23. "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." Rom. viii. 10. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?"

Digitized by Google

1 Cor. vi. 15 "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. xii. 27. "Falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." 1 Cor. xiv. 25. "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them." 2 Cor. vi. 16. "Know ye not yourselves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Cor. xiii. 5. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Gal. ii. 20 "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 17, 19. "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Eph. v. 30. "The mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but is now made manifest to his saints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." Col. i. 26, 27. "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him; and hereby we know that he dwelleth in us, by the spirit which he hath given us." 1 John iii. 24. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, dwelleth in him and he in God." iv. 15. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John 9.

The doctrine alluded to in the last quotation is mentioned in the 7th verse preceding, in these words: "Many deceivers are entered into the

Digitized by Google

world, who *confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*: this is a deceiver and an Antichrist." The same doctrine is mentioned in similar terms in, 1 John iv. 23. "Hereby know ye the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come." We are not aware that the fact that Jesus Christ, as an individual, appeared on earth in human nature, was ever made a subject of doubtful and important debate; and we are sure that the confession of this fact could never have been proposed as a test of godliness, for thousands in every period of Christianity have confessed it without making any pretensions to faith. The fact that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh of believers, is, and ever has been extensively denied, and the confession or non-confession of *this fact*, we believe, is properly and preeminently the test of the spirit of Christ and of Antichrist.

The objection usually made against the doctrine of "God manifest in the flesh" of saints, is its mysticism or absurdity. "How can God and Christ dwell in men, nay, in thousands of men at the same time?" We answer: 1. It is as easy to conceive that God dwells in any other descendent of Adam as in the Son of Mary. In him

Digitized by Google

dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." When a man shall be found who can solve all the difficulties of this declaration, we may hope to attain a full conception of the manner in which believers are "filled with all the fulness of God."

2. There is no more absurdity or mysticism in the idea that Christ, actually dwells in every member and particle of his body which is the church, than in the idea that a man dwells in every member and particle of his natural body. The separate limbs of a man are locally distinct, yet the same life pervades all.

3. There is no more difficulty in ascertaining the nature of that union between Christ and the human soul which constitutes them *one*, than there is in ascertaining the nature of that union between the human soul and body which constitutes them one. The soul is to the body what Christ is to the soul, and what God is to Christ. God is the life of Christ, Christ is the life of the soul, the soul is the life of the body. As the body and soul are one, so in the case of believers, the body, and soul, and Christ, and God are one. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the Father and the Son."

4. The characteristic of the doctrine of "God manifest in the flesh," which is called absurdity or mysticism by carnal men, is doubtless that wherein consists its virtue, as a touch-stone for the trial of spirits. No man can ever make

Digitized by Google

a genuine, intelligent confession of "Christ the Son of the living God," by any other than the *Holy* Spirit. "Flesh and blood" cannot reveal the "mystery of Godliness." Christ and his Father must come and make their abode with the believer, before he can know or confess their presence. John xiv. 20—23.

Digitized by Google

THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.

1. TIM. III. 14—16.

"These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Such is the version of one of the most interesting and important passages in the New Testament, given us by the English translators. And we venture to say there is not a more unintelligible paragraph in the English language. If the ordinary reader ever attempts to unravel its meaning, he is soon disheartened by a fruitless search for the solution of a variety of questions like the following: "In what sense is the church the pillar and ground of the truth? and what connection has this with the mystery of godliness? and what is the mystery of godliness?" &c. &c.

A literal translation, and a correct punctuation of the original, cannot fail to remove some of these difficulties. We present the following.

"These things I write unto you, hoping to come unto you soon: but if I delay, that you may know how you ought to behave in the house

Digitized by Google

of God, which is the church of the living God. The pillar and ground of the truth and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness, (i. e. the secret by which godliness is attained.) God was manifest in the flesh, vindicated in the spirit, appeared to angels, was preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

By expanding the passage, thus translated and pointed, into a paraphrase, we propose to develope more fully its meaning.

I write these things unto you (viz. directions concerning the method of dealing with the errors of those false teachers, WHO SET UP THE LAW IN COMPETITION WITH CHRIST, THE ONLY, AND SUFFICIENT SAVIOR FROM SIN, [i. 3—20.] concerning the importance of prayer, [ii. 1—8,] the conduct becoming women, [9—15,] the character and qualifications of bishops and deacons, &c) *hoping to come unto you soon: but if I delay, that you may know how you ought to behave in the house of God, which,* under the new dispensation whereof we are ministers, is not a temple made with hands, but *is the church of the living God,* the body of Christ, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead. (1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. ii. 22.; Heb. iii. 6.) In saying this, viz. that the house of God is the church of the living God, I suggest to you the doctrine which is the sum of all I preach, (Rom. viii. 9—25; Col. i. 27, &c.) which is *the pillar and the ground of the*

Digitized by Google

truth, the support and basis of the gospel; a doctrine which is *confessedly great* and glorious, as it *is the mystery of godliness*, the mystery which hath been hidden from ages and from generations, BUT NOW IS MADE MANIFEST TO THE SAINTS: which is the secret and source of all godliness. (Rom. x. 4; 1 Cor. i. 30; Phil. iii. 9, &c.) which therefore it behoves you, as a minister in the temple of God, mainly to consider and inculcate; viz. the doctrine of the UNION OF GOD AND MAN THROUGH CHRIST. The most interesting and important relations of this doctrine, may be stated as follows:

1. *God was manifest in the flesh*, in the person of Jesus Christ, who was thus constituted the mediator between God and man, the channel through which the nature of God might flow out, and be communicated to all men; the second Adam: the first father of all the sons of God. He was manifested in the flesh, not that he might institute an earthly kingdom, but that he might beget a spiritual seed in the flesh; that he might through death overcome him that hath the power of death, and thus become the pioneer and Savior, of the band of brethren of whom he was the first-born. (Gal. iv. 4, 5; Heb. ii. 10—18, &c.) Accordingly, the glory of his nature was hidden under the veil of his flesh. In the eyes of those who looked for a temporal Savior, "he was a root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness."

Digitized by Google

His life was one of sorrow, and ended in ignominy and condemnation. As his kingdom was not of this world, his life in the flesh was not the sphere of the exhibition and vindication of his character.

2. *He was vindicated in the Spirit.* When God raised him from death in a spiritual body, and having manifested him to chosen witnesses in the flesh, gave him a place at his own right hand in the spiritual world, far above all principalities and powers, and every name that is named in heaven and earth; he repudiated the accusations of this world, and vindicated the rights and character of his Son. The world that condemned him saw him no more, and the world that received him hailed him as King of kings. Rom. i. 4.

3. *He appeared to angels.* After his resurrection he was partaker of the nature, not of men in the flesh, but of angels; of course he was visible only in the angelic world. (Mat. xxii. 30; Luke xxiv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Acts vii. 55, &c.) As the inhabitants of that world (many of them at least,) were the spirits of men, (Rev. xxii. 8, 9, &c.) and as all of them were interested in his mediatorial office, (Col. i. 20; 1 Pet i. 12; iii. 19; iv. 6,) his manifestation in that world was not the least important feature in the history of his work of salvation, and was hailed by all the hosts of heaven with glad acclamations. Rev. v. 11—14.

Digitized by Google

4. *He was preached to the Gentiles.* As his mission pertained not merely to men in the flesh, but to the higher orders of the angelic world, so it pertained not merely to the Jewish stock from which he sprang, but to those who were esteemed by the Jews to be of a lower order, even to the Gentiles. Eph. iii. 4—6; Col. i. 27, &c.

5. *He was believed on in the world,* and by faith in him, the same divine nature which crucified his carnal nature, and sustained him in temptation, sorrow and death, was communicated to those who followed him in the regeneration. They were in spiritual fellowship with him, though abiding in the tabernacle which he had left. They were his representatives, preaching his words and ministering his spirit, filling up the measure of his sufferings, waiting for participation in his death and resurrection.

6. *He was received up into glory.* Thus the body of Christ, the church of the living God, stood with its Head amid the glories of the Father's presence, and at the same time, with its feet on the earth.

The sum of all that has been said is this,—God, in his Son, descended into the lowest, and ascended above the highest order of moral beings; and thus, by opening a channel of communication and establishing a union between himself and his whole kingdom, became the Savior, not only of angels but of men in the flesh, not only of

Digitized by Google

Jews but of the whole world.

Remarks. I. The beauty of the passage will be seen by making the contrast presented in each successive couplet of the six propositions.

1. God was manifested in the visible, but honored and vindicated only in the spiritual world.

2. Though in the flesh he was King only of the Jews, in his spiritual kingdom he bore the blessings of the Godhead, on the one hand into the angelic, on the other into the Gentile world.

3. Thus the temple of God stood with its foundation in this world, and its pinnacle in glory. Thus the Father, Son, Angels, Jews and Gentiles became one.

II. If any doubt whether Paul judged rightly in declaring this mystery of godliness to be the pillar and ground of the truth, let him examine the quotations and references in the preceding article, and let him ponder farther the following considerations.

1. The doctrine of the union of God and man through Christ, is opposed to *all sin*. Men cannot make their bodies the temples of God, and of idols, at the same time. Pauls confession of Christ absolutely excluded all sin—"I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." If sin found any place in such a man, it was either the sin of a dead man, or of Christ.

2. This doctrine is opposed to *all self-right-*

Digitized by Google

eousness. The testimony which Christ bore while in the flesh, he carries into every heart in which he dwells—"*there is none good but one, that is God.*" The righteousness of every believer is wrought by Christ in him, and God in Christ.

3. This doctrine is opposed to *all division.* As Christ and the Father are one, so the whole body of believers are one; one of the members of Christ can no more quarrel with another, than a man can purposely abuse his right hand with his left.

Digitized by Google

ANTICHRIST.

It will be seen, by an examination of the references under the fifth section of the Scripture Testimony at the end of the article on the Second Coming, that the primitive church, during the forty years of its earthly pilgrimage, between the first and second appearance of Christ, was constantly, and with increasing power and distinctness, warned of the coming and presence of a mighty and dangerous spiritual delusion. Christ speaks in general terms of the false pretensions and dangerous deceitfulness of the future apostates. His language is that of *prediction* only. Matt. xxiv. 4, 5. 10—12, 24, &c. Paul personifies and more distinctly characterises the mystery of iniquity, still using the language of prediction, but announcing the *presence* of the evil energy, which was soon to be developed in its more perilous power. 2 Thess. ii. 3—10. John plainly designates the deceivers whose appearance had been predicted, as *Antichrists*; clearly describes and defines their departure from the faith, and from the fact that *they had already come*, infers the near approach of him "who should consume them with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy them with the brightness of his coming." 1 John ii. 18–26. iv. 1–3. 2 John 7, 8.

Digitized by Google

As Christ is again revealing himself in the flesh, analogy would teach us to anticipate, that "the man of sin" will also again be revealed: and *facts* have even now convinced us that "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." That the upright therefore may know their own standing, and the form and character of the "son of perdition," we propose to notice several points in the testimony of Christ and the apostles, whereby we may ascertain *to whom belongs the name of Antichrist.*

1. It designates a class of men *professing to be Christians.* Many seem to take it for granted, in discoursing concerning Antichrist, that the name designates some bold, undisguised form of impiety, or at least some departure from the faith, so palpable and hideous, as not to claim without impudent effrontery, the Christian name. But it may be asked, if this be true, wherefore do we hear the voice of Christ and the apostles, loud and reiterated warning the primitive flock *against deception?* Is any danger to be apprehended to the faith of the true church from unbelieving, barefaced impiety, or from bold, palpable departure from the faith? From such sources we might anticipate wrath and persecution, but not *delusion.* You may indeed, if it please you, attach the name of Antichrist to every form of opposition to Christ, but *the* Antichrist of the New Testament, whereof we speak, is a "*deceiver,*"

Digitized by Google

a "*false prophet*," a "*false teacher*," a *lying* "*apostle*," a "*seducer*," a "*wolf in sheep's clothing*," "*having a form of godliness*," "*with all deceivableness of unrighteousness*," "*professing to know God*," and prevailing against the church, not by wrath, or violence, or blasphemy, but by "*signs and lying wonders*," by "*speaking lies in hypocrisy*," by "*creeping in unawares*," and "*privily bringing in damnable heresies*." "*Of your own selves*," says Paul, "shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." The son of perdition sits "*in the temple of God*." We must look then within the sanctuary of Christian profession, for the class of persons whose character we are seeking to develope. Antichrist is not properly and solely an *adversary* of Christ, but a *competitor*, a *rival Christ*. A professor of Christianity, of high and imposing pretensions to spirituality, and favour with God, a *teacher of religious truth* alone is qualified to enter the lists of competition with Christ, and thus endanger the faith of the church.

2. It designates a class of persons, who in connection with a profession of righteousness, *live in sin*. "Beware of false prophets, which come unto you in sheep's clothing, but *inwardly they are ravening wolves*. *Ye shall know them by their fruits*." Mat. vii. 15, 16. "False prophets shall arise and shall deceive many, and because *iniquity shall abound* the love of many shall wax cold."

Digitized by Google

Mat. xxiv. 11, 12. Paul, with significant emphasis, denominates the personified apostasy, the "*Man of Sin.*" The working of the "*mystery of iniquity,*" warned him of the coming manifestation of "*that Wicked,* whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of *unrighteousness.*" By prophecy he notified the church of the apostasy of some who should speak "lies in hypocrisy; *having their consciences seared with a hot iron*;" 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2;—having a form of godliness, but *denying the power thereof.*" 2 Tim. iii. 5. And he said of certain deceivers, who were subverting whole houses, "they profess that they know God, *but in works they deny him.*" Tit. i. 16. Peter speaks of false teachers, who walked in "*pernicious ways*;" 2 Pet. ii. 2,—and scoffers, "*walking after their own lusts.*" iii. 3. Jude speaks of ungodly men, who had crept into the church, "*turning the grace of God into lasciviousness*;" Jude 4;—and of "*sensual* mockers, *walking after their own ungodly lusts.*" 17, 19. It should also be noted, that many of the false teachers were characterized, as exercising the ministerial office, "*for filthy lucre's sake,*" Tit. i. 11;—and "through *covetousness,* with feigned words, *making merchandise*" of the saints. 2 Pet. ii. 3. There is reason to doubt whether any of these deceivers—unless perhaps we should except those who are described as "turning the grace of God into lasciviousness"—had the ef-

Digitized by Google

frontery to *profess to be sinners, and at the same time, teachers of Christianity*; yet by their fruits they were known to be sinners, and therefore hypocrites—members of the body of Antichrist.

3. It designates a class of persons, who, while professing Christianity, and living in sin, *deny Jesus Christ*, and by this last characteristic—*the denial of Christ*—peculiarly, their title to the name of Antichrist was known in the primitive church. By recurrence to the two preceding articles the nature and importance of a right confession of Christ, will be understood. By the testimony of Scripture, as well as by the experience of every living witness to the truth, the confession "that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh," (a confession which according to the obvious meaning of the language used, respects a *personal* and *present* fact,) is the distinctive and comprehensive characteristic of true Christianity. In like manner, as might be anticipated, we shall see that the New Testament makes the *absence of this confession*, the distinctive and comprehensive characteristic of *Anti-christianity*. As "God manifest in the flesh," is "the pillar and the ground of the truth," "the mystery of godliness;" even so, the rejection of this doctrine is "the pillar and the ground" of false religion—"the mystery of iniquity.

The following is only a specimen of scripture testimony on this point. "Little children, it is

Digitized by Google

the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. But *ye have an unction from the Holy One*, and ye know all things. I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth. Who is a liar, but he that *denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son.* Whosoever denieth the Son, the same *hath not the Father*: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also. Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life. *These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.*" 1 John ii. 18—26.

"Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come: and even now is already in the world." 1 John iv. 3,

"Many deceivers are entered into the world,

Digitized by Google

who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; this is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, and that we receive a full reward. Whosoever *transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.*

He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John, 7–9

"There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, *even denying the Lord that bought them.*" 2 Pet. ii. 1.

"There are certain men crept in unawares, who were before ordained unto this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, *denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Jude 4.

"Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that he told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, *not having the spirit.*" Jude. 17—19.

In these passages, it is obvious that "not having the spirit," not having the "unction from the Holy One," "denying that Jesus is the Christ," "denying the Father and the Son," "not confessing that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,' "not abiding in the doctrine of Christ," "denying the Lord that bought them," "denying the

Digitized by Google

only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ," are all equivalent expressions, characterizing the great spiritual abomination, so expressly and repeatedly predicted by Christ and his apostles. Paul has furnished us with an expression, which conveys, perhaps as clearly as any other, the idea contained in them all. "Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and NOT HOLDING THE HEAD, from which all the body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Col. ii. 18, 19. Ervey one "who confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" is spiritually *headless*, therefore dead, and if he assumes the form of godliness, he enters the lists of competition with Christ, and is therefore an *antichrist*.

It should further be observed, that the deceivers of the primitive churches, are distinctly marked as teachers of *legal righteousness*: and indeed this characteristic naturally and neccessarily accompanies the denial of Christ, when a profession of godliness is assumed. Righteousness can only be wrought in one of two ways, either first, by independent obedience to an external precept: or second, by yielding up the powers to the energy and direction of God, by faith in Christ. In other words, the *righteousness of law*, and *h*•

righteousness of faith, are the only conceivable forms of holiness. Whoever then denies Jesus Christ, and thus shuts out the righteousness of faith, lays himself under a necessity—if he makes any pretensions to godliness—of exhibiting and inculcating the righteousness of the law.

Now before Christ came, by whom the righteousness of faith was revealed, legality was not, neither could it be a characteristic of Antichrist, or of opposition to God. On the contrary, the preceptive law was an institution of God, and the righteousness which it wrought, was encouraged and regarded by him. It then occupied its appointed place, as the introductory forerunner of the righteousness of faith, and was approved as such. The law stood in the same relation to the gospel, as that in which John the Baptist stood to Christ; not as an equal or a rival, but as a servant sent to "prepare the way" of his Lord, "the latchet of whose shoes he was unworthy to unloose." So far as legalists adopt the confession of John the Baptist—"he must increase, but I must decrease"—all is right. It is only when the law stands side by side with the gospel—when John the Baptist commences competition with Christ—that the "mystery of iniquity" begins its work, and Antichrist is revealed.

Such was the competition which carried corruption and death into the very vitals of the primitive church, insomuch that Paul in righteous in-

Digitized by Google

dignation against the legalists who had perverted his Galatian converts, exclaimed, "though even an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 8, 9. And again—"I would that they were even cut off that trouble you." v. 12. The object of the whole epistle to the Galatians, and of much of the epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, was the counteraction of the corrupt influence of "teachers of the law."

The first chapter of the first epistle to Timothy is also an exhibition of Paul's hatred of legality, in which he clearly states the design and place of law, and the paramount value of the gospel.

It might easily be shown, if neccessary, by an extended examination of the New Testament in reference to this subject, that the deceivers, against whom Christ warned his disciples, who troubled and subverted the churches, and at length earned the name of Antichrist, were in the words of Paul, "*specially they of the circumcision*," the lineal descendants of that brood of Pharisees, scribes and doctors of the law, who withstood, persecuted and crucified Christ.

It will perhaps be said that the legalists of the apostolic age were teachers of the *Jewish or cere-*

monial law, and therefore present a case, whose parallel can never again be witnessed, since no one is so foolish in these days, as to attempt a revival of Judaism. But we warn such as thus put away the fear of Antichrist, that "his coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and *all deceivableness* of unrighteousness." The mystery of iniquity is not confined in its operation, to the "tithing of mint anise and cummin," and to phylacteries, and washings, and circumcision. That prevailing religion which in these days is baptised with the name of Christianity, has its ordinances, and its holy days, and its sacred observances, which furnish as ample materials for the appropriate developement of a legal spirit, as Judaism ever furnished. The righteousness of the law is the same thing, whether it manifest itself in a Pharisaical observance of prescribed ceremonies and of the traditions of the Jewish elders, or in a forced and formal obedience to the burdensome requisitions of "new measure" taskmasters. Every form of godliness which lacks its power, i. e. "God manifest in the flesh," is as deceitful, pernicious, Antichristian legality, in 1834, as it was in the apostolic age. Show us a teacher of religious truth who bears the first mentioned marks of Antichrist, viz. *a profession of godliness, with a sinful life, and a denial of Christ*, and we will show you without further in-

Digitized by Google

quiry, *a teacher of the law.*

The result of our inquiries is this: *The name of Antichrist belongs to those who deny the personal union of believers with Christ, and live in sin, while they profess and teach legal righteousness.*

There is reason to believe that many professors and teachers of righteousness, who have in vain puzzled themselves with attempts to identify scriptural delineations of Antichrist with the developements of history, will find themselves, upon a more thorough investigation of the subject, in the predicament of one, standing before a mirror, and after many fruitless endeavours to ascertain whose image is before him, at length discovers that it is *his own.*

Every member of the body of Christ, who has ever been crucified by contact with the mystery of iniquity, will know the value of the tests given us by the word of God. Though Satan be transformed into an angel of light, and his ministers into ministers of righteousness, his apostles into apostles of Christ, he may easily and surely be unmasked and disarmed, and his ministers put to confusion and shame, by the simple application of these tests. We must be permitted to say in conclusion, we believe the decisive battle between the kingdom of light and darkness, will be fought on the ground which these tests cover. The controversy will not be simply a competi-

Digitized by Google

tion between righteousness and sin, *as such*, but between the righteousness of God and self-righteousness—between true Christianity and false,—between Christ and Antichrist. He that would await the evil day therefore, in the whole armor of God, should clearly understand the *mystery of godliness* and the *mystery of iniquity*.

Digitized by Google

THE SABBATH.

A CONVERSATION BETWEEN AN ORTHODOX MINISTER, AND A PERFECTIONIST.

Minister. I understand your doctrine abolishes the Sabbath.

Perfectionist. By no means. I am taught to keep seven holy days in a week, and twenty four holy hours in a day.

M. But you have no particular regard for the first day of the week.

P. My Bible says—"Let no man judge you in meats or in drinks or in respect of an holy day or of the new moon or of the Sabbath days, which are a *shadow* of things to come, but *the body is of Christ.*" In observing one holy day, without being holy yourself, you have the shadow. In keeping all days holy by receiving the complete holiness of Christ, I have the substance. My Bible also says, "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

M. But you know the moral law ordains the observance of one day in seven, as a special holy day.

P. True—the law of Moses commanded the Jews to observe the *seventh* day. If you appeal to the law of Moses, I must charge you with violating that command. Saturday is the Jewish

Digitized by Google

Sabbath—you have no authority from Moses for observing the first day of the week. If you appeal to the law supposed to have been given to Adam, Gen. ii. 3. the same charge lies against you. Besides, I deny that even the observance of the seventh day was enjoined upon men, as is commonly supposed, until the law was given by Moses. In Gen. ii. 3. Moses evidently assigned the reason for the law given on Sinai, and not in the garden of Eden.

M. But the seventh day of the week, was exchanged for the first, when Judaism was exchanged for Christianity.

P. By what authority?

M. The fact, that Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week, pointed out that day as the Christian Sabbath.

P. So says tradition, but tradition has no authority with me. In a matter of such importance as you esteem the right observance of the Sabbath to be, "Thus saith the Lord," ought to precede every assertion.

M. But history informs us that the primitive church did observe the first day of the week, and we believe they did so by the authority of the apostles, whose instructions were preceded by, "Thus saith the Lord."

P. The two first links in your argument are, still bad. "Thus saith the Lord," hangs upon "History informs us," and "we believe"—By a

Digitized by Google

chain similar to this, the Pope holds the keys of heaven. History and human opinion can have no authority in this matter. I must still demand a "Thus saith the Lord." Besides my bible, which is surely the best history, informs me that *part* of the primitive church *did not* observe the first, or any other day of the week, "One man esteemeth one day above another, *another man esteemeth every day alike.*" Rom. xiv. 5.

M. In 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. it is written, "Now concerning the collection for the saints as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the *first day of the week*, let every one of you lay by him in store as God has prospered him," &c. It is evident from this passage, that the meetings of the church were held on the first day of the week, with the sanction of the apostle. The same thing appears in several other like passages.

P. Your argument still is only a feeble inference from a trivial hint. "Thus saith the Lord" is wanting. Besides I may fairly deny your inference, and call upon you to *prove* that the meetings of the primitive church were exclusively held on the first day of the week. When you have done that, I shall call upon you to prove that this fact stamps authority upon the observance of the first day of the week. It only furnishes evidence to me, that the primitive churches, ceased to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a-

day of special worship.

M. John speaks of "the Lord's day," Rev. 1 10, evidently alluding to the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection, the day observed by his followers in the time of the apostles.

P. I say once more, and once for all, allusions, inferences, opinions, traditions, church histories, every thing aside from the simple word of God, are without authority in relation to a matter so important and arbitrary as the special observance of the first day of the week. In order to gain any thing for your argument from John's expression, "the Lord's day," you must first prove that he refers to the first day of the week, and then, that this reference enjoins or sanctions its special observance. This cannot be done without "travelling out of the record," into traditions, conjectures, &c. where I cannot follow you.

M. But what will be the moral influence of abolishing the Sabbath? Surely it will open the floodgates of wickedness. Every thing sacred will be swept away. Good men, within the last few years have been making special efforts to fortify the Sabbath, considering it the great bulwark of Christianity.

P. Recollect, in the beginning of our conversation I repudiated the charge of abolishing the Sabbath. The Bible teaches me to observe a perpetual Sabbath. Judge now as a wise man, whether the injunction to observe a perpetual, or

Digitized by Google

a weekly Sabbath will best secure the interests of morality and religion; whether an example and conversation which teaches the people to be *always* holy, to do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus will do more good than a weekly interruption of worldliness; whether the substance is better than the shadow. Paul seems to have deprecated the influence of periodical observances as postively hostile to Christianity. "After that ye have known God, or rather are known of him, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? *Ye observe days*, and months, and times, and years, I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labor upon you in vain." Gal iv. 9—11. The religion, whose chief bulwark is the *observance of a day*, cannot be the Christianity of Paul's time. Its aspect rather accords with that of the religion, whose influence secured the crucifixion of the Son of God. The accusation which the Scribes and Pharisees most frequently fastened upon Christ, was, that he violated the Sabbath. If the Sabbath is the chief bulwark of such a religion, I shall not scruple, for any fear of results hostile to *true* Christianity, to give my voice for its overthrow.

Digitized by Google

BAPTISM.

Paul speaks of "the doctrine of baptisms" (Heb. vi. 2.) as among the elementary instructions of the gospel, a "first principle," like repentance, faith, &c. which even babes in Christ might be supposed to understand. Surely then, we may expect, before examination, to find that the word of God furnishes to the sincere inquirer, evidence by which he may easily arrive at satisfactory and certain conclusions concerning a subject which thus stands at the entrance of the Christian's pathway. We propose therefore, in this article, to step aside from the numberless controversies on this subject, which have long rent the visible church—controversies which obviously prove, that one or both of the parties engaged in them, have been ignorant of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ—and examine in simplicity for ourselves, and for the assistance of our readers, the record of God. We shall conduct this examination, by quoting the most important passages in the New Testament, relating to Baptism, and adding such remarks as they suggest.

Matt. iii. 10, 11. "I (John the Baptist) indeed baptise you with *water*, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am

Digitized by Google

not worthy to bear, he (Christ) shall baptise you with the *Holy Ghost* and with fire."

In each of the other Evangelists, this declaration of John is recorded, (Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. John i. 26,) and Christ himself repeated it just before his ascension. "John truly baptised with *water*, but ye shall be baptised with the *Holy Ghost*, not many days hence." Here then, we have in the beginning of each of the first five books of the New Testament, an explicit statement of "the doctrine of baptisms;" the very doctrine, doubtless, to which Paul alluded, in using the plural of the word *baptism*. The doctrine manifestly is, that *water-baptism*, belonged to the ministry of John, and the *baptism of the Holy Ghost* to that of Christ. These primary statements are so simple and clear, that we cannot wonder that Paul regarded "the doctrine of baptisms," as one of the "first principles" of the instructions of the gospel; and if on further examination, we find nothing inconsistent with the view they present, we shall have no difficulty in forming our judgment on the subject. It is plain, that all occasion for dispute about the *mode of water baptism* is removed, unless indeed we consider John the Baptist our spiritual head instead of Christ. If, in professing to be Christians, we rank ourselves among the followers of Christ, and not of John; we must regard *water baptism* as an ordinance belonging to a *past* dis-

Digitized by Google

pensation, and of course all controversy concerning it as ill-timed foolishness. We are subjects of the dispensation to which the *baptism of the Holy Ghost* belongs. We receive the substance of which John's baptism was the shadow, and have no more occasion for dispute about water baptism than about circumcision, or any other ordinance of Judaism.

Matt. xxviii. 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*"

The intent of this direction evidently accords with the doctrine, which John and Christ had before explicitly and repeatedly stated, as we have seen. These words of Christ commissioned his disciples to baptise, not with water, for that was John's baptism, but "in the name [i. e. with the power] of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," which alone was the baptism of Christ. We must suppose that Christ perfectly understood the doctrine of baptisms, the difference between John's baptism and his own, and used this language, with that distinction in his mind. If he had intended to perpetuate John's baptism, surely he would have explicitly commissioned his disciples to baptise with *water*. This he did not do, but on the contrary explicitly commissioned them to baptise in *his own* name, of course with *his* baptism, and "in the name of the *Holy Ghost.*" The fact that his disciples *understood*

Digitized by Google

him as directing them to continue the ministration of baptism by water, which they had before practiced, (John iv. 2.) by no means militates with this view. They did indeed understand him in this inferior sense, and proceeded on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards to administer water-baptism. But his meaning in this case, as in many others, must not be determined by their understanding, but by his own declarations concerning the same subject in other places. While he was with them in the flesh, they received most of his instructions in a carnal inferior sense. They knew him not as Lord of that spiritual kingdom, which "cometh not with observation;" they read his character and instructions, in the "letter," not in the "spirit." In allusion to this, he said to them, "These things have I spoken to you, being yet present with you, but the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall *teach* you all things, and *bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*" John xiv. 25, 26. With this anticipation, he spoke to them. His personal instructions are therefore to be construed, not according to *their* immediate understanding of them; but with reference to that subsequent teaching of the Holy Ghost, of which these instructions, were but a text-book. A notable illustration of these remarks occurs in the very verse which has occasioned them, "Go

Digitized by Google

ye and *teach all nations.*" In these words Christ surely designed to give the disciples an unlimited commission, as also in Acts i. 8; yet a long time elapsed before they knew the extent of their commission. Nearly ten years after the day of Pentecost, Peter for the first time discovered, by the intervention of a miraculous vision, manifested both to himself and Cornelius, that God had broken down the wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, and he was at liberty to "teach all nations." We need not wonder then, that they who received the unlimited commission, "Go ye and teach all nations"—in a sense which restricted them to the Jewish people, received also the accompanying direction, "baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," in a sense which led them for a season to continue the water baptism of John. These remarks are equally applicable to the parallel passage in Mark xvi. 16, "He that believeth and is *baptised* shall be saved." The obvious meaning is, "he that believeth and is baptised," not with the water baptism of John, but "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the baptism of Christ, "shall be saved."

John iv. 2. "Jesus himself *baptized not*, [with water;] but his disciples." The fact that Jesus did not baptise with water, and John's special notice of it in this passage, accord with, and con-

Digitized by Google

firm the view we have presented. Why did not Jesus baptise, if water-baptism is a christian ordinance? He insisted upon being baptised himself, with water, at the commencement of his ministry, "*that he might fulfil all righteousness;*" being made under the law, it was necessary that he should be subject to all the ordinances of the law, and especially to that ordinance, which most immediately fore-tokened his own work. But surely he failed to fulfil one very important part of righteousness, in neglecting to give his followers an example of the *ministration* of water-baptism, if he designed that they should perpetuate it as a Christian ordinance. If a Christian minister should never baptise with water, he might well defend his conduct, by appealing to the example of his Master. Our next quotation will show, that Jesus Christ did not send his apostles to baptise with water, and therefore his example was consistent with his instructions.

1 Cor. i. 14—17. "*I thank God that I baptised none of you,* but Crispus and Gaius: lest any should say that I baptised in my own name; (and I baptised also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptised any other.) For *Christ sent me not to baptise,* but to preach the gospel." The fact that Paul baptised any with water, is easily explained by his own words in the same epistle, 1 Cor. ix. 20, &c. "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew;—to them that are

Digitized by Google

under the law, as under the law, &c. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." In accordance with this principle of accomodation which he adopted, he not only administered water baptism, but circumcision, (Acts xvi. 3,) and we might argue as plausibly for the continuance of circumcision, as of John's baptism, from the example of Paul. He baptised but few of his converts at Corinth, and probably as few elsewhere, and thanked God that he baptised no more. Evidently it was a matter of expediency, not of obligation with him, "for," says he, "Christ sent me, *not to baptise*, but to preach the gospel"—in other words, "Christ sent me not to baptise with water, but with the Holy Ghost"—for "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation." Paul was a minister of the Spirit of the living God. 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6. It is plain then that a minister of the *Gospel*, has not only the example of Christ, but of Paul, his chief apostle, in favor of dispensing with the ministration of water-baptism, as a Christian ordinance.

Acts ii. 38. "Then said Peter unto them, Repent, and *be baptised*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, &c."

We quote this passage as a specimen of many similar passages in the Acts of the Apostles, exhibiting the doctrine and practice of the first ministers of Jesus Christ. We need quote no more, for we concede without reluctance all that

Digitized by Google

can be asked for the argument in favor of water baptism, derived from the example of Peter and his associate apostles. Beyond controversy, on the day of Pentecost and afterwards, they baptised with water, in compliance with what they supposed to be the last direction of their Master. Yet we shall be permitted by all, save the *worshippers of saints*, to question for reasons already stated, whether the apostles in this early stage of their ministry, rightly understood the directions of their Master. Their doctrine of baptisms was manifestly at variance with the instructions and examples of Christ and Paul, except on the supposition that they were yet partially, at least, in the dispensation of John the Baptist. We cannot believe, in view of the truths which we have previously discussed, that *as ministers of the gospel of Christ*, they prescribed and practiced water-baptism. As ministers of the doctrine and baptism of John, their course was consistent with the instructions of their Master. Yet their example plainly furnishes no argument in favor of water-baptism, unless we make John our leader, instead of Christ. Many circumstances combine to induce the belief, that they were thus in the first stages of their ministry, in a measure the disciples of John. 1. Their preaching and his were nearly identical. "John verily baptised with the baptism of *repentance*, saying unto the people, that they should *believe* on him that should

Digitized by Google

come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ." Acts xix. 4. Such also was the preaching of the apostles, on the day of Pentecost and afterwards, "*Repent* and be baptised, &c." "*Repent* and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, *when* the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and *he shall send Jesus Christ unto you*, &c." Acts iii. 19, 20. *Faith* in a *present* Savior is confessedly the foremost doctrine of the gospel of Christ, the gospel which Paul preached; whereas the apostles, like John, preached chiefly *repentance*, and pointed the people "to him that should come after." 2. As John in his personal ministry was for a season cotemporary with Christ, so we believe the dispensation of which John was the head, was for a season cotemporary with that of which Christ was the head. The doctrine and baptism of John were for a season after the day of Pentecost, blended with the preaching of Christ and the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But we believe also, that as John said with reference to Christ, "He must increase, but I must decrease," so the doctrine and baptism of John after the day of Pentecost, gradually gave place to the doctrine and baptism of Christ. God seems to have pursued the same order in this case, as in the entire transition from Judaism to Christianity, and in every other change of dispensation; introducing the new dispensation, not by a sudden exchange,

Digitized by Google

but by a gradual process, like the blending of light and darkness in the dawn of the morning. 3. We are expressly informed, (Acts xviii. 24, 25,) that, long after the day of Pentecost, a man who was "mighty in the scriptures," "fervent in spirit," and "*instructed in the way of the Lord*," was yet only a disciple of John. "A certain Jew, named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism of John.*" By this circumstance we may discover, that the influence of the dispensation of John, was for a season, to some extent, intermingled with that of the Christian dispensation. 4. Paul gives us to understand, (Gal. i. & ii.) that Peter and his associate apostles were, for a long time after the commencement of their ministry, judaizing and contracted in their views of the gospel of Christ. He says, "Fourteen years after," [i. e. about twenty years after the day of Pentecost,] "I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also, and I went up by revelation, and *communicated unto them*, [i. e. the apostles and their followers,] *that gospel*, which I preach among the Gentiles, &c. Of those that *seemed* to be somewhat, whatever they were, it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man's per-

Digitized by Google

son; for they who *seemed* to be somewhat in conference *added nothing to me, but contrariwise,*" &c. He afterwards plainly shows to whom he alludes in these expressions, "*James, Cephas* [or Peter,] and *John*" were they, "who *seemed* to be pillars." Afterwards, he states that he "withstood Peter to his face," for his blameworthy judaising. We recommend to such as are disposed to worship saints, and make apostolic practises immutable laws, a careful perusal of this passage in Paul's writings. It will be found that Paul scrupled not to differ in doctrine and practice from those who had been "apostles before him." We need not wonder that he spoke so lightly as we have seen, of that water-baptism, which those apostles prescribed and administered in the beginning of their apostleship. 5. If it is objected in answer to what has been said, that the apostles baptised with water, while *under the guidance of the Holy Ghost*, we reply, in the first place, though we should admit that the Holy Ghost did actually direct them to baptise with water, we might still assert, that no one can truly follow their example, who baptises *without the special direction of the Holy Ghost.* But we deny that there is any evidence, that the Holy Ghost did direct them to baptise with water. We cannot ascribe all their actions and views, to the influence of the Holy Ghost. For a time they evidently regarded circumcision as a Christian

Digitized by Google

ordinance. Was this a doctrine of the Holy Ghost? They regarded the Jewish nation as alone entitled to the blessings of the gospel.—Were they taught this by the Holy Ghost? Peter so conducted, that Paul withstood him to his face, "because he was to be blamed." Did he act under the guidance of the Holy Ghost?—Manifestly the Jewish practices and views, which the apostles had received, not from the Holy Ghost, but from their previous education, must account for many things in their conduct; and what portion of Judaism would be more likely to adhere to them in the beginning of their apostleship, than the baptism of John—the recent introduction and celebrity of which, seemed doubtless to characterize it as a permanent ordinance of the new dispensation? It is said that Philip baptised the eunuch, (Acts viii. 38,) under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. The only evidence in favour of this assertion is the fact, that Philip was directed by the Holy Ghost to preach Christ to the eunuch. The *inference* from this is, that he subsequently baptised him by the direction of the Holy Ghost. Observe this is only an inference. It is not *said* that the Holy Ghost dictated the baptism. On the contrary, it *is* said that "the *eunuch* said, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?" The suggestion of water-baptism, came from the eunuch, and not from the Holy Ghost. When a passage shall be

Digitized by Google

found in the record of God, directly ascribing the ministration of water-baptism to the direction of the Holy Ghost, we shall be ready to admit, that there is some plausibility in the argument for its continuance as a Christian ordinance; but while feeble inferences alone, are the foundation of that argument, we must be permitted to receive the instructions and examples of Christ and Paul, as paramount to the instructions and examples of those apostles, who, while they "seemed to be pillars," *were* yet manifestly, to a great extent, under the influence, of Jewish habits and doctrines.

1 Peter iii. 20, 21.—"Eight souls were saved by water, [i. e. in Noah's ark,] the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (*not the putting away of the filth of the flesh*, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

It is evident from this passage, that Peter's views of baptism, were rectified at the time he wrote his epistles. The baptism of which he here speaks, is expressly declared to be, not that which washes away "the filth of the flesh," i. e. water-baptism; but that which purifies the conscience, i. e. the baptism of the Holy Ghost. By giving heed to this explanation, we shall have no difficulty in discerning the connection, which he suggests, between baptism and the resurrec-

Digitized by Google

tion of Christ. Water-baptism can scarcely be strained by any latitude of fancy, into a type of the resurrection of Christ. John the Baptist, with whom it originated, evidently designed no such allusion. He administered it according to the character uniformly ascribed to it in the New Testament, and in the traditions of the Jews, as an ordinance of *initiation*—a rite by which its subjects were introduced into a new dispensation. As such, it was properly a type of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which believers are introduced into the Christian dispensation. Water-baptism stood in the same relation to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as that in which John the Baptist stood to Christ. That we may understand how the baptism of the *Holy Ghost* is connected with the resurrection of Christ, it is only necessary that we bear in mind, that believers are thereby baptised *into Christ*, become members of his body, and of course partakers of his resurrection. This is plainly the meaning of Paul in the following passage. Rom. vi. 3—5. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised *into Jesus Christ*, were baptised into his death? Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism*, into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, *we shall be also in the likeness*

Digitized by Google

of his resurrection." Col. ii. 10—12. "Ye are complete in him, &c. buried with him in baptism, *wherein also ye are risen with him*, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Paul plainly defines the baptism, of which he thus speaks, in the following passage. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For *by one spirit.* are we all *baptised* into one body." Gal. iii. 27. "For as many of us as have been baptised into Christ, have *put on Christ.*" Believers becoming *one* with Christ, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, while they remain in the flesh, have fellowship with his death; inasmuch as his incarnation was in the largest sense *his death;* and at the same time they have fellowship with his resurrection, inasmuch as their head, whose spirit is theirs, has overcome death. "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." 1 Peter iii. 18. The connection of baptism with the resurrection of Christ, may be imperfectly illustrated by the following case. In working subterranean mines, it is often necessary to remove water that flows into them, by means of an engine which alternately raises and lowers large buckets through the shaft which constitutes the entrance of the mine. Such excavations are also oftentimes liable to explosions, by reason of the

Digitized by Google

inflammable gases which infest them. Suppose that a workman in such a mine, is informed by the appearance of his lamp that an explosion is at hand. At the same moment the water-bucket is just about to ascend. Rushing from a fiery and dreadful death, he plunges into the ascending bucket, and is safely raised to the upper world. *He is baptised into a resurrection.* The primitive church was awaiting the explosion of the fiery vengeance of God, in the judgment of the Prince of this world. Christ came in the flesh, "descending into the lower parts of the earth, and ascending above all heavens." He thus became the shaft of communication between the caverns of sin and the heavenly world. "*I am the way.*" John xiv. 6. His resurrection also became the power by which believers were exalted into heavenly places. "*I am the resurrection.*" John xi. 35. His descent into the darkness of this world was his death. Hence believers plunging into his blood were baptised into his death; and having fellowship with him in his victory over death, were baptised into his resurrection; and when the wrath of God burst upon the Man of Sin, were found safely reposing with him in the bosom of the Father.

Peter, in the passage which has suggested these remarks, represents the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark, as a type of the salvation of the primitive church, by baptism into the

Digitized by Google

resurrection of Christ. The flood of water in the type is a storm of Judgment-fire in the anti-type. The ark is Christ. The entrance of the ark is "baptism into Christ." As the flood came upon the ark, and it rose above the waters, safely bearing its inmates, till the dry land reappeared, so Christ became a refuge for believers, in the midst of the fiery vengeance of God, and by the power of his resurrection, bearing them above the burning billows that rolled over those, who, in the day of Judgment, were not found in him, gave them a resting place in the kingdom of his glory.—With these views, we perceive that Peter very properly represented baptism as a *saving* ordinance. "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now *save* us" Without baptism into Christ, by the Holy Ghost, none can be saved.

Eph. iv. 4, 5. "There is one body, one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, *one baptism*." If water-baptism was in Paul's view a Christian ordinance, he has not spoken in this passage according to the form of sound doctrine: for he says in Cor. xii. 13. "*By one spirit* are we *all* baptised into one body," showing that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was regarded by him as *one* baptism, of universal necessity, and if water-baptism was in his view, equally necessary, he should have said — one Lord, one faith, *two baptisms*." Observe

Digitized by Google

further, in the two passages we have quoted, he was manifestly treating of the same subject, viz. *the unity of the church.* In one he speaks expressly of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as pertaining universally to the church: in the other he declares that but *one* baptism pertains to the church. By thus comparing the two passages, we cannot avoid the inference, that he regarded the baptism of the Holy Ghost as the *only* baptism pertaining to the church. This view alone accords with his own declaration and practice, and those of Christ as we have before seen. As he states that only *one* baptism belongs to Christianity, in determining his meaning, we have only to choose between John's baptism and Christ's. One *must* be rejected. We know which Christ rejected. "Jesus baptised not" [with water] John iv. 2. We know which Paul himself rejected. "Christ sent me not to baptise" [with water.] 1 Cor. i. 17. The conclusion is unavoidable, that Paul's "doctrine of baptisms," a doctrine which he regarded as one of the elementary instructions of the gospel, rejected water-baptism, and retained only the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as a necessary appurtenance to Christianity.

Thus we have noted or alluded to all the passages of the New Testament which have seemed to us to have any bearing on the "doctrine of baptisms." In conclusion, we may balance the evidence we have before us thus. *Evidence in*

Digitized by Google

favor of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as alone belonging to Christianity ; 1. The testimonv of John recorded by all the evangelists. 2. The testimony of Christ. Acts i. 5. 3. The commission which Christ gave his disciples. 4. Christ's example. 5. The testimony of Paul. 6. The example of Paul. 7. The testimony of Peter in his epistle. *Evidence in favor of water-baptism.* The example of Peter and his associate apostles in the beginning of their ministry ; subtracting the evidence that they were at that time partially the disciples of John the Baptist.

With such a balance before us, we cannot but be astonished that any should be found in 1834, clinging to the baptism of John, and our astonishment is increased by the fact, that the multitudes who do thus cling to the baptism of John, are generally more earnestly at war with *each other*, respecting the mode of "putting away the filth of the flesh ;" than with the devil in behalf of that gospel-baptism, which gives "the answer of a good conscience towards God." We doubt not, that immersion was the primitive mode of water-bubtism. But we still say, that a single immersion in water is no more *Christian* baptism, than a single sprinkling of water. Even as shadows of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, one is no better than the other ; for the baptism of the Holy Ghost is called "the blood of *sprinkling*," Heb. xii. 24, and was typified by the sprinkling

Digitized by Google

of the blood of the sacrifices under the law. It is also most frequently represented as an *effusion*. Acts ii. 17. &c. The sacrament of the Lord's supper shadows forth the reception of the Holy Ghost, by the figure of "*drinking*." See also John vii. 37—39. The truth is, the operation by which believers receive the Holy Ghost is properly represented by any or all of these modes combined. It makes little difference whether a spunge is dipped or sprinkled—whether water is poured on it or overflows it. If it is *filled* with water, we care little whether it was filled by an operation which is called "immersion" or "effusion," or "sprinkling," or "drinking." He that receives Christ by faith, is *baptised* with the Holy Ghost, is *sprinkled* with the blood of Jesus, the spirit is "*poured out*" upon him, and he is "made to *drink* into that one spirit." We confess however, the first figure suits our taste better than any other. We love to think of Christian baptism, AS AN EVERLASTING IMMERSION IN THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

Digitized by Google

FAITH.

"He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Every form of faith, without which it is impossible to please God, necessarily contains these two elements, viz. first, a belief of the existence of God; second, a belief of his benevolence, and of course an expectation of a reward in seeking him. The man *who has never sought after God*, may exercise faith, thus elementarily described; and indeed, in the order of nature, such faith *must* precede all attempts to secure the favor of God. I cannot seek access to a man, of whose existence I am ignorant, and I shall not seek favors from one, unless I believe he has the power, and will, to do me good. Between this starting point in the race of faith, and the goal which they have reached, to whom God has become all in all, we may discover and describe endless varieties and degrees of confidence in God. If I believe to day in the existence of a God whose locality is above the heavenly firmament, and to morrow discover that he is an omnipresent God, I have advanced a step in the course of faith. Again: if I believe to day only the general proposition, that the omnipresent God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek

Digitized by Google

him, and to morrow discover that he actually answers my prayers, I have advanced another step. If I sincerely and diligently seek after God, my faith will increase as my knowledge of him increases. Discovering his care over me, I trust his providence for temporal blessings—perceiving the power of his spirit, and the holiness of his character, I trust him to keep me from the ways of wicked men. Finding that in his presence is fulness of joy, I trust his love will one day deliver me from the bondage and darkness of a sinful nature, and fit me for full and endless fellowship with himself. As God reveals his good will and power to me, my faith advances from one blessing to another, till that righteousness which alone can qualify me for the enjoyment of his glorious presence, becomes the object of my heart's desire; and trusting in him, I see a cloudless prospect of eternal deliverance from sin in a future world.

Thus far faith advanced under the Jewish dispensation. Thus far, before Christ came, God had revealed himself as the rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Abraham received not the promise of the new covenant, but saw it afar off and rejoiced; and all who followed in his footsteps before the advent of Christ, though they obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, but stood with him rejoicing in the hope of eternal righteousness. The effect of

Digitized by Google

faith in this stage of its advancement, upon the character and conduct may easily be seen. As faith is necessarily limited by the revelation which God makes of himself, if Abraham diligently sought after God, if his faith kept pace with his discoveries of the good will of God, he was perfect in his day—not perfect, as being conformed to the image of God—but perfect as being conformed to his imperfect discoveries of God. The carnal mind—the will of the flesh, is enmity against God. Brutes have the carnal mind, and yet they are *not* sinners. Why? Because they have no knowledge of God. They are perfect in their place, not as being conformed to the image of God, but as fulfilling the end of their being. On the same principle, Abraham might be perfect in his place, without that knowledge of God, which displaces the carnal mind. It is manifest, however, that his perfection can be no standard by which the perfection of those to whom God has farther revealed himself, shall be measured. The legitimate effect of perfect faith in the imperfect revelations which God made to man, during the Jewish dispensation, was to stimulate believers to the performance of the works of the law. In observing the statutes and ordinances of the law, they did the work of *servants*, because they trusted in so doing, God would ultimately make them his sons. If it be true, as many seem to suppose, that God has

Digitized by Google

made no greater revelation of himself to the world than was given to Abraham and the Jewish saints, we may call ourselves believers, while we rest contented to stand with them, as servants under the law, in *hope*, not in *possession*, of righteousness. But if Jesus Christ has revealed the Father, and this revelation is worthy to be called a glorious gospel, before we call ourselves *Christian* believers, we must inquire, what is the gospel?—and whether our faith corresponds to the tidings it brings?

The following passages from the word of God explicitly state the object for which Jesus Christ came into the world—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for *he shall save his people from their sins.*" Matt. i. 21. "He was manifested *to take away our sins.*" 1 John iii. 5. "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, *that he might destroy the works of the devil.*" 1 John iii. 8. If this is the gospel, sinners are not *Christian* believers; for the faith which corresponds to his revelation of the good-will of God, must be inconsistent with the commission of sin. If God sent his Son into the world for the purpose of saving his people from their sins, they who trust him are saved from their sins, or God is defeated in his purpose.

What then is the nature of *Christian* faith? How shall a man who believes that God is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, become a believer of that gospel which brings

Digitized by Google

salvation from sin? We will endeavour to trace the transition.

Suppose the man stands in the situation of a Jewish believer, a sinner, under the law, but rejoicing in the *hope* of righteousness and fellowship with God in a future world. He hears that God sent his son into the world to save all who trust in him from their sins. This is glad tidings to him, and he willingly believes it, because it brings that salvation to his door which he had hitherto supposed afar off. Difficulties and objections are easily removed from the mind of one who hungers and thirsts after righteousness. Suppose then his mind has settled into a conviction that the glad tidings he has heard are true: Though he is not in possession of the salvation of which he has heard, he has advanced in faith a step beyond the state of a Jewish believer. He has discovered that the feast which before he looked for at the end of a life of labor, is ready for him now. He withdraws his thoughts from that prospect beyond the grave which had cheered him, ceases from his labor, and sets himself to find his Father's table.

The question before him now is—*how* am I to be saved from sin? The gospel answers, *by the power of God.*—"But can this be done consistently with my free agency?" Ans. If God could dwell in Jesus Christ, controlling all his actions, and yet leaving him a free agent, he can

Digitized by Google

do the same in any other human being, to whom he can gain access. You know by experience, that he can, in some measure, at least, manage your spirit, and dispose you to righteousness, without interfering with your free agency—why cannot his control over you be *perfected* consistently with your freedom? Moreover you expect to be kept by his power in eternal righteousness after death, and yet to be free—Why should you doubt his power to begin this work before death? Suppose the inquirer to be convinced that God can dwell in him as he did in Christ, and save him from sin, leaving him free—a second step is taken towards the possession of a perfect salvation. The next question is—"*How* shall I become the subject of that power of God which brings salvation?" The gospel answers, *by faith in his Son*—"What is faith in the Son of God?" Ans. It is a conviction accompanied with a confession that *Christ is in you*, a whole saviour. Unbelief replies—"Christ is not in me."

Here is the critical spot where the contest between the devil and the Son of God is to be decided, and here we resort to the record which God has given of his Son. Let it be remembered that the word of God must stand, if it contradicts your previous conceptions and feelings. If it declares that Christ is in you, your ignorance and unbelief of the fact cannot prove this decla-

Digitized by Google

ration false. On the contrary it *may* be proved, that your ignorance and unbelief have crucified the Son of God in you, and that he only waits for the permission of your faith to burst the tomb of your heart and manifest his presence. We will not speculate upon the question of the *possibility* of Christ's presence in those who are ignorant of the fact—you cannot dive deep enough into spiritual philosophy to prove it impossible, and I cannot dive deep enough to show you *how* it is true, but we can both read the plain statements of the word of God. John says of Christ —the Word of God—"In him was life, and *the life was the light of men*; and the light shineth *in darkness*, and *the darkness comprehended it not*. That was the true light which lighteth *every man* that cometh into the world. He was *in the world*, and the world was made by him, and *the world knew him not*." John i. 4—10. From this passage it appears, that the *life* of the Word of God, lighteth every human being. It will not be pretended that the gospel—the *external* light of the word of God, lighteth every man that cometh into the world. What meaning then can be attached to the passage, unless we believe the Son of God in becoming incarnate, gave life to *all flesh*, "came a light into the *world*" of darkened *spirits*, so that he is actually life and light to those who know him not. "The light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehended it

Digitized by Google

not." Shall the darkness therefore deny that the light shines? "The world knew him not"—shall the world therefore deny that he has come into the world? You have hitherto been ignorant of the fact that Christ is life and light in you—shall you therefore deny the fact, in contradiction of the testimony of God?

The following passage more fully unfolds the meaning of those we have already examined. "There are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, *that God hath given to us eternal life:* and this life is in his Son." 1. John v. 8—11. There are three agents, or elements of salvation in the spiritual world, corresponding to spirit (or wind,) water, and blood, in the natural world. Water is that which cleanses the outside, (see John xv. 3. Eph. v. 26.) to which the external word corresponds. "Blood is the life"—the vital element of the inward man. So the blood of Jesus Christ is the life of the soul. The spirit or air is the medium in which, and by which the blood and water have their action, and

Digitized by Google

without which the blood would be useless. So the witnessing spirit of God is that without which the blood and water of Jesus Christ, i. e. his spiritual life and instructions are of no avail. "He that *believeth* hath the witness" of the spirit. "He that believeth *not*" hath the *blood*, i. e. eternal life, and perhaps the water, i. e. the word; but these are of no avail without that faith which admits the witness of the spirit. The life of Christ is a light shining in darkness, till the spirit bears witness. "He that believeth not hath made God a liar— because he hath not believed the record that God gave of his Son: and this is the record, *that God hath given to us eternal life*, and this life is in his Son." The life then of the Son of God is actually and unconditionally given to every man, *before believing*—else how can unbelief in respect to this record make God a liar? If God has given eternal life only to them that believe, unbelievers cannot be required to believe that God has given *them* eternal life, for this is not true. Yet it is plainly declared that unbelievers make God a liar in respect to "the record that God hath given to us eternal life." These declarations can in no way be reconciled with each other, unless we believe that the "Eternal life" i. e. the Son of God, (see 1 John i. 2 and v. 20.) "is the light shining in darkness"— "that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Thus believing, the method of salvation

Digitized by Google

by Jesus Christ is a plain matter–1. Every man, by the gift of God, has eternal life, though he be ignorant of the fact–2. God sends forth the word of his gospel to apprize men of this fact–3. He that believeth this word receives the Holy Ghost, and is born of God. 1. The blood is given, 2. the water, 3. the spirit. Thus God is the Savior of *all* men, *specially* of them that believe.

Again—— "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, *the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*" Rom. v. 18. A comparison is here instituted between Adam and Christ, as also in 1 Cor. xv. 42—45. in which the operation of the righteousness of the second Adam is represented as reversing the work of the first. By the first Adam all men become partakers of a fallen nature, which is nevertheless not in itself sinful, inasmuch as Christ was made in the likeness of it, and was yet without sin; thus proving the possibility of living in human nature without sin, and thereby condemning sin in the flesh. "By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned.*" In consequence of Adam's sin, all men become partakers of a nature, not necessarily sinful, but uniformly prone to sin. Each man *by his own sin*, secures to himself the appropriate curse of a sinful nature. By reversing this statment we as-

Digitized by Google

certain the nature of the work of Christ. He is the second Adam, the root of the race. By him all men become partakers of a nature, not in itself righteous, but adapted to the fulfilment of righteousness. Each man *by his own act*, i. e. by faith, secures to himself the appropriate blessings of a righteous nature. The gospel announces to them, who, by sin, are following the first Adam to death, that God has given them through Christ a new nature, the appropriate fruits of which are righteouness and peace. Unbelievers continue to follow the first Adam—believers "put off the old man, and put on the new man"—"walk not after the flesh but after the spirit;" are saved from their sins. As there are now two Adams, so all men have two natures—flesh and spirit—and these are opposite one to the other. While the old man lives, the new man is crucified. When the new man lives, the old man is crucified. The old man lives by unbelief—the new man by faith. By the gospel we are made to know, that God has repaired the ruins of the fall, and "we are no longer debtors to the flesh;" "Christ has come *in the flesh*"—not in a single man, merely, but in the whole of human nature. While men believe not, he is crucified in themselves. When they believe, he rises from the dead, and reveals himself a conqueror, in themselves.

Again, "The righteousness which is of faith

Digitized by Google

speaketh on this wise, say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above: or who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it? The WORD *is nigh thee, even in thy mouth,* AND IN THY HEART: that is, the word of faith which we preach: [Paul preached Christ] that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. x. 6—9. This is a specimen of Paul's method of preaching the gospel. To those who ask "what must we do to be saved?"—he answers—cease to look out of yourselves for the salvation you seek—turn to the light of Christ *within*; the word of God is in your heart—when you so believe this, that you are willing to confess it, you will he saved from sin.

We will now take for granted that the enquirer is intellectually convinced that according to the word of God, *Christ is in him,* and that he must believe this, in order that he may receive salvation. Now he asks—"How shall I get this faith?" We answer by an illustration. Suppose a man has in his hand a good note for a hundred dollars, which he supposes to be nothing better than waste paper. He is told that it is a genuine note. His thoughts run thus—"While I remain in unbelief, this note is worth nothing to me; if I could believe that it was genuine, I should be

Digitized by Google

richer by a hundred dollars, in feeling and fact than I am now ; how shall I get this faith ?"— Common sense answers, by examining the note, and the character of the maker of it. The Bible is the record of the will of God, by which men are declared possessors of eternal life. Common sense teaches any one who wishes to believe this, to examine the record and character of him who gave it. If an intelligent and careful examination of this kind does not produce faith, the reason must be sought in the spirit of the inquirer. He stands at the gate of a kingdom, into which no idols can be carried. He knows if he believes and confesses that Christ is in him, he will be severed from every object of earthly affection. Men do not readily believe tidings which cross their interests. " How can ye believe, who receive honor one of another, and seek not that honor, which cometh from God only." Is it asked, what shall a man do, whose heart is wedded to some earthly object, who yet desires to believe ? We answer, your case is hopeless ; unless by some means you shall be brought to abandon your idol. You can never *with the heart* believe the word of God, while your heart is otherwise engaged.— While the God of this world blinds your mind, the glorious gospel can never shine into it. The man who is willing to part with every thing for the knowledge of Christ, who sincerely hungers and thirsts after righteousness, will easily believe

Digitized by Google

the word which announces his salvation. When an honest man gives an account of events, which even involve no special interest, his hearers believe him as a matter of course. No *effort* to believe is thought of. But how easily and eagerly do men believe, when they hear good tidings touching a matter concerning which they have been anxious! If I am in a state of anxious suspense about the safety of a friend, and a messenger brings the word—"He is safe!" the eager joy of faith rushes through me like an electric shock—I have immediate peace in believing. So the gospel is no sooner heard than believed, by one who truly thirsts for the water of life. When he hears the word of God—"Christ is in you, a conqueror over sin and death! All is safe!"—he believes at once, and believing, passes from death unto life.

If the inquirer declares himself willing to part with his idols, and yet cannot believe, we must search through his spirit again for the reason of his unbelief. Perhaps he is saying in his heart, "I would believe, if I could *feel* that Christ is in me, and I am saved"—in other words—"I will believe the testimony of my own feelings, but not the word of God." This is wrong. A right spirit says—"Let God be true and every man a liar—God says he has given me his Son and eternal life—my feelings contradict his record; my feelings are the liars—God is true; I know

Digitized by Google

and will testify that Christ is in me a whole Savior, because God declares it, whether my feelings accord with the testimony or not." If you wish for peace and salvation by the witness of the spirit, *before* you believe, you wish for the fruit before there is any root. Righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, are the *consequences* of faith—the word of God, and that only, is its foundation. The man who holds the note for a hundred dollars, in unbelief, cannot expect to *feel* richer than usual, till he believes the note to be genuine—and he would be considered a very foolish man, if he should say in answer to arguments in favour of the genuineness of the note—"I feel as poor as ever, therefore the note cannot be good." Christ says, "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come into him, and sup with him, and he with me." Let the inquirer understand, that believing the word of God opens the door for the admission of the living witness. It is wrong in this situation to say, "I would open the door if I could *see* him who stands on the outside." You cannot see through the door of unbelief. You hear the Savior's voice—that is enough—believe, open the door, and you shall see him and sup with him. While you are asking for sight and supper, before you open the door, Christ is suffering for your folly, knocking without.

Digitized by Google

If the inquirer is now convinced that he is not to look for peace before believing, but in believing; nothing is wanting to complete his salvation, but such a confidence in what his intellect perceives to be the truth of God, as will produce a *confession*, that Christ is in him, a Savior from all sin. He can try his faith by such a question as this—"Am I willing without further evidence, relying solely on the testimony of God, to confess Christ a whole Savior?" Confession, or a willingness to confess Christ, is the accompaniment rather than the consequence of faith. Intellectual belief becomes an *active* principle, a belief of the heart. In the very act of confession. It is to no purpose in this spot, to make *experiments* upon God, as many have attempted to do, by undertaking to believe, while confession is withheld till the success of faith is ascertained. A whole-hearted, and everlasting surrender to the faithfulness of God alone, can secure the fulfilment of his promises to faith. Such a surrender can be made only by a confession, which leaves no way for retreat. Men are permitted to enter the kingdom only on condition of destroying the bridge behind them.

As God is true, the man who thus confesses Christ, shall be confessed of him, before the Father. His peace shall be like a river, and his righteousness as the waves of the sea. By the witness of the Spirit, he shall know that he is a

Digitized by Google

child of God, and *know* that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin: for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

It is no part of the business of him who preaches this gospel, to give directions for the conduct of inquirers *after* they believe—neither is it any part of the business of the inquirer to seek to know beforehand the course he will pursue. He follows the word of God like Abraham not knowing whither he goes. Forgetting the things which are behind, and taking no thought for the morrow, he *rests* in God. The faith of Jewish believers, as we have said, stimulated them to legal obedience. The faith of the gospel requires men to cease from their own works, to enter into rest. If I promise a man a reward at the end of a journey which I prescribe, faith in me will prompt him to the effort necessary to perform the journey. But if I promise him the same reward, and withal offer to *carry him* through the journey, on the single condition of his committing himself to my care,—faith in me will *forbid* the effort, which before it required of him. His responsibility in relation to the journey and reward, touch only the single act of committing himself to my care. After that act, confidence in my faithfulness will make him as fearless and as careless about the way, and the success of the journey, as if he had no interest or agency in the

Digitized by Google

matter. So in respect to salvation from sin—man's responsibility touches but a single act—that act of faith which has been described. As it is *the righteousness of God* which is revealed in believers, as we are saved *by grace* through faith, we are responsible only for that surrender of our hearts, which permits the grace of God to work his righteousness in us.

We have endeavoured to describe Christian faith, the act by which man submits himself to the righteousness of God. If it is said—"Faith is the root of righteousness, and you have represented faith as man's act, so that after all, the agency of man is the source of salvation"—we reply—Faith is the gift of God, for "faith cometh by hearing, and *hearing by the word of God.*" God is the giver of the gospel, and the gospel is the food of faith, so that salvation is wholly of grace. The blood of Jesus Christ, which is eternal life, is the gift of God. The water of the word which apprises men of their possession of eternal life, is the gift of God. The spirit which bears witness in believers, and saves them from sin, is the gift of God. To him be glory forever.

Digitized by Google

THE RESURRECTION.

Paul mentions "the resurrection of the dead," (Heb. 6. 2.) as one of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. It will be found by an examination of all those passages in his writings, which distinctly state the great topics of his preaching, that this subject was held by him as paramount in importance to all others, not excepting even the death of Christ. The discussion of the resurrection in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, commences thus—"Brethren I declare unto you *the gospel* which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are *saved*," &c. After briefly stating the death of Christ, the apostle presents the fact of his resurrection, as the sole foundation of the believers hope, and the chief subject of that gospel which he had received and preached—"If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain," &c. (v. 14.) In giving directions to Timothy concerning his ministry, Paul says—"Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David *was raised from the dead according to my gospel*." 2 Tim. ii. 8. His estimate of the relative importance

Digitized by Google

of the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ may be seen in a multitude of passages like the following—"Now it was not written for his (Abraham's) sake alone, that it (faith) was imputed to him (for righteousness,) but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him *who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*; who was delivered for our offences, and *raised again for our justification*." Rom. iv. 23—15. "If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be *saved by his life*." Rom. v. 10. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, *yea rather that is risen again*," &c. Rom. viii. 34. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that *God hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved." Rom. x. 9. &c. By these specimens of Paul's preaching, we may discover the occasion of the charge brought against him by the Athenians, that "he seemed to be a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus, and *the resurrection*." Acts, xvii. 18.

Paul evidently preached the resurrection of Christ, not as a mere historical truth, or as a pledge of the future and distant resurrection of believers, but as *a ground, of present justification*—as *the* truth that is the food of saving

Digitized by Google

faith. His views of its present moral bearing, will be seen in the following passages.

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that *like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father,* EVEN SO *we also, should walk in newness of life*—for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, *we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*" Rom. vi. 1—5. It is necessary to understand the nature of the baptism, of which the apostle here speaks, in order to perceive the force of his argument. The following texts determine the nature of Christian baptism—"As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ—for *by one spirit are we all baptised into one body.*" 1 Cor. xii. 12–18. "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, *have put on Christ.*" Gal. iii. 27. By the baptism of the Holy Ghost, believers *become one with Christ:* the reasoning of the apostle then, proceeds thus. "How *can* they, who have become one with Christ, continue in sin? His

Digitized by Google

death to sin has become theirs, and they are united with him, in his resurrection. The same power of the Father, which raised him from the dead, secures them from sin"—"For," says he, (Rom. viii. 11, 12,) "if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, *he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies*, by his spirit that dwelleth in you—*therefore* brethren, we are debtors not to the flesh, to live after the flesh," &c. In other words—if Christ is in us, his resurrection is in us, we are "quickened together with him," and are no more in bondage to a carnal nature. Again, Paul prays, (Eph. i. 9—20,) that the saints might know, "what is the *exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe*, according to the working of his mighty power, *which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead*." In thus preaching the resurrection of Christ, as a power operating in his whole body, and at once redeeming all the members of that body from the bondage of the flesh, the apostle very properly represents it in the 15th chapter of the 1st of Corinthians, as the very keystone of the gospel—"If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, *ye are yet in your sins*." v. 17. "JESUS, AND THE RESURRECTION," is no more nor less, than "JESUS, AND SALVATION FROM SIN." Subvert the doctrine of the resur-

Digitized by Google

rection, and you annihilate the gospel; for the author of the gospel, was "called JESUS, because he should *save his people from their sins.*" Mat. i. 21. "He was manifested, that he might take away our sins." 1 John, iii. 5. Without the doctrine of the resurrection, we may indeed proclaim that Christ died for our offences, but what avails his death, if the sinner must still cry, "O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"—and such must be his cry, if Christ was not "*raised again for his justification.*" Let the slave of sin appropriate to himself, as he may, the benefits of the *death* of Christ, if he cannot make the *resurrection* of Christ his own, he must still remain in "the horrible pit and miry clay." In order to save a man, who has sunk in the filth and darkness of a "horrible pit," two things are necessary; first, the man who undertakes to save him, must *descend* into the pit; second, he must *ascend* with him that was lost. The annunciation of the *descent* of a Savior, would furnish but poor consolation to the sufferer in this case, if his faith could not fasten at once upon the hope of his *ascent*. Even so, to preach the death of Christ, without commending his *resurrection* to the faith of sinners, is little better than to mock their misery. In order to redeem men from the curse and power of sin, Christ must first *descend*

Digitized by Google

into fellowship with them, and then "*ascend* above principalities and powers," in other words, he must die and rise again. This he has done, according to Paul's gospel—"*When he ascended up on high*, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens," &c.) Eph. iv. 8, 20. Hence. Paul could say to one who dwells "in the lower parts of the earth"—who cries from the bottom of the — "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"—"Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above,) or who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) The word is nigh thee, even in thy heart, and in thy mouth; that is the word of faith, which we preach, (viz. "Jesus and the resurrection.") that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart, that *God hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved." Rom. x. 6 9. Confessing *Christ within you*, you testify your apprehension of his descent into the deep. i. e. his death—believing in your heart that God hath raised him from the dead, your faith receives his resurrection *in yourself*, and you find

Digitized by Google

yourself lifted out of the dark abyss of sin and death, and sitting with him in heavenly places.

The consequences of this doctrine are so startling, that Paul seems to have anticipated the charge of insanity—2. Cor. v. 13—17. "Whether we be *beside ourselves*, it is to God; or whether we be sober, it is for your cause—for the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then *all died*, (see the original.) and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and *rose again*. [Believers are "*married* to him that was raised from the dead,"—See Rom. vii. 4: "are members of his flesh and of his bones,"—see Eph. v. 30. The wife lives not to herself, but follows the estate of her husband. If her husband has past death, and stands in the resurrection, she looks upon death as behind her, and herself as raised from the dead. That we do not pervert the meaning of the apostle, will be seen by the inferences which he immediately draws from the foregoing statement.] "*Wherefore* henceforth know we no man *after the flesh:*" [inasmuch as we are not in the flesh, but with Christ in the resurrection; and inasmuch as the death and resurrection of Christ have given to all men the same exaltation—looking at the truth as it is in Jesus, we see all have

Digitized by Google

past death, and are risen with him;] "yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." [Christ *in the resurrection* is our salvation and the subject of our gospel,] "*Therefore* if any man be in Christ, he is a *new creature:* old things are passed away; behold, *all things* are become new"—[he has passed from a carnal state into the resurrection, from this world into the heavenly world—his state and relations are as fully changed, as the idea of a translation from earth to heaven demands.]

One of the most obvious inferences from these truths is, that believers by fellowship with Christ in his resurrection, are released from the beggarly elements and carnal ordinances of that worldly sanctuary which they have left. As "he that is dead is freed from sin," so he that is freed from sin is freed from the law; for "the law is not made for a righteous man." The law with its "shadows of good things to come," cannot carry its claims beyond death. If Christ died for all, he made an end of the law and its shadows for all. Such was the judgment of Paul—"ye are complete in him—buried with him in baptism, wherein also *ye are risen with him*, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead; and you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision

of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses: *blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances* that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, *nailing it to his cross*, &c. Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath day, &c. *If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why as though living in the world are ye subject to ordinances?*" Col. ii, 10—20. Believers, passing into the resurrection, not by literal death, but by faith, living not to themselves, but to him that died for them and rose again, look back to his cross as the monument of their transition from earth to heaven—see the ordinances of the worldly sanctuary nailed to it, as trophies of his triumph—and find themselves with him in the freedom befitting a heavenly state.

As the resurrection of Christ released men from sin, which is the sting of death; and from the law, which is the strength of sin, it manifestly destroyed, in respect to believers, the dominion of him that hath the power of death. Their life was hid with Christ in God. They had "*everlasting* life." That change which was called death by the servants of sin, was to them the consummation of their resurrection. These remarks cover the transition period, from

Digitized by Google

the resurrection of Christ, till his second coming. During that period, the promise of Christ —"*he that believeth on me shall never die,*" was substantially, though not literaly fulfilled. The saints of that age, though they were married to Christ in the resurrection, were yet so far within the territories of him that hath the power of death, that they did not escape the *form*, though they were saved from the *sting* of dying. Paul, standing in the front rank of the host, testified, that he had not yet attained the resurrection of the dead, (Phil. iii. 12) and he severely condemned some who said, that the resurrection was past already, (2 Tim. ii. 18.) yet he was striving to "apprehend that for which he was apprehended of Christ," "and looking for the Lord Jesus Christ" from heaven, to change his vile body. Phil. iii. 12—21. He also assured the churches, by the word of the Lord, that the time would come, and that speedily, when the *power* of death should be abolished,—and mortality be swallowed up of life. 1 Cor. xv. 51, &c. Death was the last enemy that should be overcome. During forty years, the power that raised Christ from the dead was revealed in believers, redeeming them from sin and the law, sustaining them in the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, advancing them from one victory to another, till at the end of the Jewish dispensa-

Digitized by Google

tion death was wholly destroyed, and the bride of Christ was changed into the likeness of his glorious body. We leave it to the leisure of others to calculate what *is* the hope of the calling of those who believe on Christ 1800 years after his perfect victory over death—thanking "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that according to his abundant mercy, he hath begotten *us* to a *lively* hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

THE END.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

DO NOT REMOVE
SLIP FROM POCKET

DEMCO

Digitized by Google

ALF Collections Vault
3 0000 113 062 727

Digitized by Google